

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
BIRTH OF STONEWALL JACKSON

## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today is the 150th anniversary of the birth of one of America's most illustrious sons—Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson. On January 21, 1824, Thomas Jackson—later known to his troops and to the world as "Stonewall"—was born in the western region of Virginia in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va.

We are aware of Jackson's accomplishments during the Civil War. Indeed, accounts of his brilliant battlefield tactics and slashing strategies are required reading for every student of military history.

I comment briefly on certain aspects of "Stonewall" Jackson's character. It has been a matter of concern to me that too often we have stressed the methodical and rigid nature of this outstanding West Virginian. We have heard the story of Jackson sitting the entire night in the superintendent's waiting room at VMI because the superintendent forgot their appointment and left by another door. Also, there have been printed and reprinted articles on what many persons have termed his "religious fanaticism." Lest this idea of the so-called inflexibility of the Jackson character go uncorrected, I submit several excerpts from his own writing and that of historians.

In his letters from Mexico, shortly after his graduation from West Point, Jackson noted:

The morning hours I occupy in studies and business, and generally taking a walk after dinner, and sometimes a ride on the Paseo. \* \* \* The book I am now studying is Lord Chesterfield's letters to his son translated into Spanish; so that whilst I am obtaining his thoughts, I am also acquiring a knowledge of the Spanish tongue. \* \* \* Subsequent to this I shall study Shakespeare's work.

Can this be the comment of a person with limited interests?

After the birth of his daughter, Jackson wrote to his wife:

Don't you regard it as the most precious little treasure in the world? Do not spoil it, and don't let anybody tease it. Don't permit it to have a bad temper. \* \* \* Give her many kisses for her father.

At a later date, he wrote:

I am glad to hear that she enjoys outdoors, and grows, and coos, and laughs. How I would love her sweet ways. That her little hands have lost their resemblance to mine is not regretted by me.

Certainly, these words are revealing and dispel the idea of his complete rigidity and stern nature.

Mr. President, in the civic-minded city of Clarksburg, where an impressive equestrian statue of Jackson is located in the plaza of the Harrison County Courthouse, across the street from the

Stonewall Jackson Hotel, the anniversary of the birth of Jackson continues to be commemorated by historical and service organizations.

On this 150th anniversary, I am indebted to S. J. Birshtein, chairman of the Stonewall Jackson Historical Committee of the Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce, for providing us with some additional historical insights about this great man.

This brilliant officer during the War Between the States acquired the sobriquet or nickname of "Stonewall" with the stubborn defense of his 1st Brigade in the First Battle of Manassas—Bull Run—on July 21, 1861.

Gen. Barnard E. Bee in rallying his men exclaimed,

See, there stands Jackson like a stone wall.

A near rout for the Confederate forces was turned into an overwhelming victory. Throughout the Confederacy and the world he became "Stonewall" Jackson.

General Jackson was one of the ablest of the Confederate officers, and was probably the greatest corps commander on either side during the war.

One of the best tributes to Stonewall Jackson was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur, at the unveiling of the bronze bust of Jackson in the Hall of Fame at New York University on May 19, 1957:

Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southwest Pacific area of World War II, "The mantle of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson has now fallen on your shoulders."

Mr. Birshtein has said that the Clarksburg Public Library has an original letter by Jackson on exhibit, together with a miniature replica of the Polaris submarine, the *Stonewall Jackson*, and other diversified mementos dealing with General Jackson.

Also on display is an excellent sketch by Bruce Haymond of Jackson's birthplace now occupied by a mercantile store.

A large oil painting by David Van Pelt is also on exhibit in the library. This painting of Jackson is by Edwin F. Draughman and is a fine copy of the famous original by John A. Elder in the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C.

A ladderback rocker which belonged to Jackson's mother can also be seen in the library.

The original letter by Jackson was presented to the library by the late D. H. Hill Arnold, an eminent attorney in my hometown of Elkins, grandnephew of Stonewall.

The letter, postmarked West Point, is addressed to Jackson's sister, Mrs. L. "Laura" A. Arnold of Beverly, Randolph County.

Stonewall wrote his sister of his preparations for the annual examination at West Point and reported that his health

was "very good at the present." He requested that his sister inform him as to the subscription rates of "the Democratic paper published in Clarksburg."

It is testimony to the measure of the man, Stonewall Jackson, that both the sovereign States of Virginia and West Virginia claim him as a son. West Virginians, indeed, take justifiable pride in the landmarks that illustrate a part of his life. In Clarksburg, a bronze plaque marks the location of his birthplace.

He lived as a boy and young man in what is now Lewis County, in the Mountain State. Stonewall Jackson was 18 years old when he became a constable of Lewis County. Following the death of his parents, who died in poverty, Stonewall was reared by his uncle for 12 years before entering West Point in 1842.

Jackson was a born fighter. In his youth he fought poverty. He fought for an education at West Point. There he struggled against prejudice and disadvantage. Jackson learned what he set out to learn by sheer effort. He was a man with a soul of fire. Action was his life.

Stonewall Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the age of 39. His short but successful life ended sadly as a result of wounds inflicted by his own troops through an unexplicable mistake during the Battle of Chancellorsville. West Virginia was admitted to the Union as the 35th State on June 30, 1863, only 6 weeks after the dying hero, perhaps recalling his boyhood days on the West Fork River, uttered these final words:

Let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of the trees.

PROVIDING A STAY-AT-HOME  
FOR THE PRESIDENT

## HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written lately about the President and his travels to and from the White House, Camp David, San Clemente, and Key Biscayne. Several articles criticizing Government expenditures on these pieces of property have appeared. I wish to share with my colleagues at this time the suggestions of Mrs. Josephine Patten, a constituent of mine. Mrs. Patten, recognizing that a public figure has private needs as well as public obligations, proposes that the United States furnish private residences for the President and Vice President and maintain the White House for State occasions and visiting dignitaries.

I submit her letter to you at this point for your consideration.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: In the light of all the uproar over the present administration and of the President's homes and his traveling by commercial flight, etc., I think

it's time to give consideration to a measure to ease the situation.

In the first place, we provide a home and a retreat for the President. It seems logical that he should abide there and to this end, I would like to have it against the law to expand federal monies on the private properties of any office holder. I don't think the President needs four or five tax-supported homes.

At the same time, I am sure that life in the White House is not all peaches and cream, either. So I propose this: that the White House be maintained for state occasions and for housing visiting dignitaries and for the President's office, but that a new and totally private mansion be built for the President's occupancy. That this be the President's home and not open to the public. And that another one be built for the Vice-President. That these be tastefully furnished and decorated and maintained according to a budget for that purpose and to the taste of the occupant (within reasonable bounds, of course). And that that be it! Those will be their homes for the duration of office and they'll have to live there or be without all the extras they feel they want to be surrounded with—including security. (As it is now, the V.P. has no home and the President lives in a museum.)

You can build quite an imposing house for a million dollars, Congressman. And who ever said the American people want Nixon's San Clemente home when he's done with it? It's a whole continent away from Washington. The next President won't be from San Clemente—that seems evident enough. I'm sick of Florida and Texas and California and Pennsylvania "White Houses"—that's a bunch of baloney.

So let's build some homes for our two top executives and let them stay in them. Keep the White House for historical purposes and state occasions—as the house of the people. Which it really is.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) JOSEPHINE PATTEN.

#### LABOR'S ROLE IN POLITICS

### HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, any meaningful study of campaign financing and the reforms which need to be made in the public interest cannot be complete without a thorough investigation of labor's role in politics and how it raises its money and distributes it to candidates and what it does to influence elections.

On January 2, the Washington Star-News editorialized on the need for Congress to make a close examination of the role of unions in campaigns. All of the points in this editorial are well taken. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, most of whom were out of this area and probably missed seeing the editorial when it appeared in the Star-News.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the editorial, "Labor's Role in Politics" appear in the appendix of the RECORD. The editorial follows:

#### LABOR'S ROLE IN POLITICS

It would seem that after Watergate the drift ought to be toward curbing excesses by special interests in political campaigns. But organized labor intends, instead, to throw

its weight around more than ever in the 1974 congressional races.

AFL-CIO President George Meany has sent out the word that he wants a "veto-proof" Congress, which means he wants at least a couple dozen Republican House members knocked off, along with half a dozen or so Republican senators, so that Congress will be even more heavily Democratic than it already is. Meany's minions are scurrying to carry out his orders. As reported in the news section of this paper the other day, the words "dazzling" and "overwhelming" are being used to describe the amounts of money and manpower the labor movement expects to put into the campaigns.

During the Watergate investigation, much has been made of illegal corporate contributions and of suitcases full of cash floating around in the 1972 campaign of President Nixon, but not much has been heard about the enormous amounts of money and services put into presidential and congressional campaigns by labor unions.

The AFL-CIO's political arm, the Committee on Political Education, annually raises millions of dollars of "hard money" from its members to distribute to favored candidates. So do other independent unions. But this is peanuts compared to the value of goods and services contributed by members at the direction of union officials at the national, state and local levels.

We don't believe that union leaders, any more than officers of big business, ought to have an undue influence over candidates and campaigns. George Meany's personal politics, with his shifting loves and hates, don't exactly qualify him as one who should be dictating the makeup of Congress. What's good for Meany, in the political sense, is not necessarily good for the working man, or the country.

With Watergate and all its excesses fresh in its mind, the Congress might well make a close examination of the role of unions in campaigns when it gets down to work in 1974 on a further tightening of election laws.

#### NEW STATE DEPARTMENT COUNSELOR

### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, early this month, Helmut Sonnenfeldt of Chevy Chase, Md., was sworn in as State Department Counselor. Confirmation of his appointment followed thorough hearings and investigation of his 23 years of Federal Government service, which were so extensive that he was said to be "the most investigated person in town."

More significant than his survival of this proceeding was the fact that Mr. Sonnenfeldt was sought simultaneously for top positions in both the Department of State and the Treasury Department by Secretary Kissinger and Secretary Schultz.

In becoming Counselor at the State Department he brings great talent and experience as a highly regarded political analyst in the State Department's Office of Research and Analysis, a specialist in disarmament affairs, and as Director for Soviet and Eastern European research for the State Department. His earlier career included U.S. Army service in the Pacific and European theaters as a mem-

ber of the counterintelligence corps. He received his B.A. and M.A. in political science from Johns Hopkins University. He has also served as lecturer on Soviet Affairs on the faculty of Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

At his swearing in, Mr. Sonnenfeldt was praised by Secretary Kissinger for his—

Invaluable contributions to East-West relations, SALT and discussions on mutual force reductions—and his contributions to the whole philosophy of foreign policy.

#### TRIP TO ISRAEL

### HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ernest Goldblum of Harrison, N.Y., has been a longtime supporter of the State of Israel, and a crusader for the rights of the more than 3 million oppressed Jews in the Soviet Union. He recently made an important factfinding trip to Israel and I thought my colleagues in the House might like to see a copy of a letter which he sent to me briefly summarizing his findings:

WESTCHESTER CONFERENCE  
ON SOVIET JEWRY,  
Harrison, N.Y., January 16, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PETER PEYSER: I just returned a few days ago from Israel where I was able to make the most comprehensive study regarding absorption of the Jews coming from the Soviet Union. The task, which is a most gigantic one in numbers, when compared to an immigration of 82,000 people since 1969, which would be in equivalent of over six million people in the United States, or a half million in the state of New York alone.

The immigrants are given a quick screening upon arrival to determine where they could fit most efficiently regarding trade and education, as well as religious desires plus any family attachment they may have here. For example, a carpenter who would be able to obtain employment as one, would probably be settled and housing provided near his job; a schooling would then be provided for his children, and he probably would be taught the language and customs during the evening.

A person with a degree or sophisticated qualifications where the language is absolutely essential, would be placed in an absorption center, where he and all members of his family would be taught the language and customs at an accelerated pace. These absorption centers either provide meals in a central dining room, or have kitchen facilities in the individual apartments.

The Jewish Agency is indeed performing an incredible job to provide the needs, and are continuing the task to make Israel a home for those fortunate Jews, who are able to come from the Soviet Union.

The publicity generated by the fact that some very very few Soviet Jews wish to return, seems grossly exaggerated, and should be in no way related to the opportunities afforded by the agencies in Israel. In percentage, the amount is less than 1/4 of a percent, and their reasons seem to be in no way related to facts, as given by the publicity widely distributed by some of the news media in the United States.

A co-worker returned from an extended trip to Europe, studying the same as I did and found a few families from Rome who had found it very hard to adjust to the life in Israel and are attempting to settle elsewhere but are still grateful for the assistance offered to them.

In Israel I was contacted by a man from Vilnius (Soviet Lithuania). To his deep regret and sorrow his son and his wife were not permitted to leave, even though all of his closest relatives were living in Israel. He asked me for help, among other things, to try to speak to his son in the Soviet Union. I was able to accomplish this reaching him by phone. His son rejoiced upon hearing my voice and renewed his hope that people are still concerned about his fate and are trying to help him. He ended his conversation with me with "Shalom" and thank you.

Yours respectfully,

E. GOLDBLUM,  
Chairman Westchester Conference on  
Soviet Jewry.

#### THE RETIREMENT OF A PILLAR OF THE HOUSE

### HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving with the Honorable H. R. Gross, Member of Congress from Iowa for 15 years.

We have served together on subcommittees where I was the chairman and he was the ranking Republican member.

I hope that he does not get angry with me for pointing out that he was the most cooperative and responsible Member of Congress I have ever served with.

His integrity, his desire to accomplish something every day he has been in the Congress were among the greatest assets of any committee we have served on together.

Mr. GROSS has on many occasions walked an extra mile to make a quorum for a subcommittee executive session so that we could vote on legislation that he may not have supported. I can bear personal witness to this side of his career in Congress as a subcommittee chairman.

The Members of the House are of course aware of his daily activity on the floor.

I wish that I had the mathematical skill to compute the number of hours of preparation that supported the number of hours of skilled debate by Mr. Gross in the House.

I wish that I had the skill to compute with any accuracy the amount of money saved the taxpayers, because all of the rest of us in committee had to look forward to the searching cross-examination of the gentleman from Iowa when we brought legislation to the floor.

It is with pleasure that I note, that Congressman Gross has become somewhat of a hero to some members of the liberal press at the end of his long career, because of his courage, his industry, and his influence compelled attention, and his sincerity compelled admiration. Such a turn of events is even

more noteworthy, since Mr. Gross never wasted a second seeking adulation in 26 years.

It is difficult to find words to describe the value to the House of a colleague who in all of his days and nights since 1949 has devoted his waking hours to the House of Representatives. The media cannot capture the essence of such service since its headlines are devoted to fashionable causes.

There may be one way of judging the career of H. R. Gross and that is in the high regard he is held by the membership of the House of Representatives in this Congress and all of the Congresses of the fifties and sixties and into all the seventies, because his example will live on with us after his retirement.

In summation let me say, that his career proves how valuable to his country one Member of Congress can be.

#### GROSS BUREAUCRATIC INVASION

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the grassroots leaders of Illinois, and especially the small businessmen, are justifiably irritated at the constant work load that is imposed on them by bureaucratic regulations. This subject is very effectively editorialized in the Sunday, January 6 issue of the South Suburban Opinion a publication servicing Cook County, Ill.

The editorial follows:

#### GROSS BUREAUCRATIC INVASION

Government bureaucracy is liked by no one—except those who have found careers in its murky depths. Yet few appreciate the full cost of the federal bureaucracy, nor the extent of its influence and control over nearly every field of human endeavor. The expense of filling out forms for a bewildering array of governmental administrative agencies has become a major cost to business, as well as to consumers. The accompanying regulatory control is frequently in basic conflict with the principles of the competitive business system.

A typical example of this is a proposal to require annual "Line of Business" reports to be submitted to the Federal Trade Commission. Such reports would be required from companies covering each line of business in which they were engaged and eliciting information of the most detailed sort on sales, costs and profits. In the case of many retailers selling a great variety of merchandise, the separate reports required could conceivably run into the thousands. The Federal Trade Commission alleges that buyers could use the data on sales, costs, profits and assets to form judgments concerning the appropriateness of price/cost margins and profit rates. This is not likely. It is further claimed that sales promotion activities and expenditures should be related to sales to see if the proportion is too high and may deter competition. Likewise, the program's proponents suggest that research and development expenditures, like sales promotion, may be excessive and anticompetitive.

The question is, who is to determine whether sales promotion expenditures are

too high and in relation to what? Similarly, who is to judge whether research and development costs are excessive? There is but one answer—a government bureaucrat who will presume to possess greater wisdom concerning competition in the marketplace than people who have spent their lives working in that marketplace. As one critic of this advance of government bureaucracy into the lives of private citizens observes, "This proposal is so totally at odds with the accepted concept of the American free enterprise economy and its business system with the accepted concept of the American free enterprise economy and its business system that it is compelling reason to totally reject the proposed Line of Business reports."

#### STAMP COMMEMORATING FOSTER FAMILY CARE

### HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill which provides for the issuance of a commemorative stamp to honor "Foster Family Care."

I do not know how many of my distinguished colleagues have had any experiences relating to foster children, but I have fond memories as a young father of stopping by a foster family home to pick up the foster kids so that they would have a ride to school with my kids. An arrangement such as this may seem minor, but is indicative of the self-help nature of the foster family care program. The people who are a part of the foster care program are highly motivated, self-giving individuals with a sincere desire to help provide those children in need of temporary care, a happy and healthy family environment in which to live.

There is an average of 350,000 children living in 150,000 foster families during any given year. These children are unable to remain in their natural family settings, because their parents cannot properly care for them. A high percentage of these children have some type of physical or mental illness. But there is also a large group of families which suffer symptoms of alcoholism, drug addiction, and other family disorganizations which lead to child neglect.

The foster family care program is basically a State and county responsibility. There are no Federal agencies as such which subsidize the program, but there are some moneys available from titles IV(A)—Aid to Families With Dependent Children, and IV(B)—Child Welfare Services, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Children's Bureau in the Social and Rehabilitation Services of DHEW is the Federal information source for foster care programs.

It is with deep respect and gratitude that I offer this bill for the issuance of a stamp commemorating foster family care, to give national recognition to all the worthy and dedicated foster parents who are so deserving of this acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the "Bill of

Rights for Foster Children," which the National Action for Foster Children Committee drew up and ratified at their annual meeting held in Philadelphia's Congress Hall, April 28, 1973. These 10 articles express the deep concerns of the committee that every foster child has the same rights inherent to all children.

The bills follow:

H.R. 12177

A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of Foster Family Care

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Postal Service is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp in recognition of Foster Family Care. Such stamp shall be of such denomination and design, and shall be issued for such period, as the United States Postal Service shall determine.

**BILL OF RIGHTS FOR FOSTER CHILDREN**

Ratified in Congress Hall, Philadelphia, Saturday, the Twenty-eighth of April, Nineteen hundred and seventy three.

Even more than for other children, society has a responsibility along with parents for the well-being of foster children. Citizens are responsible for acting to insure their welfare.

Every foster child is endowed with the rights inherently belonging to all children. In addition, because of the temporary or permanent separation from and loss of parents and other family members, the foster child requires special safeguards, resources, and care.

Every foster child has the inherent right:

Article the first—to be cherished by a family of his own, either his family helped by readily available services and supports to assume his care, or an adoptive family or by a plan, a continuing foster family.

Article the second—to be nurtured by foster parents who have been selected to meet his individual needs and who are provided services and supports, including specialized education, so that they can grow in their ability to enable the child to reach his potential.

Article the third—to receive sensitive, continuing help in understanding and accepting the reasons for his own family's inability to take care of him, and in developing confidence in his own self-worth.

Article the fourth—to receive continuing loving care and respect as a unique human being . . . a child growing in trust in himself and others.

Article the fifth—to grow up in freedom and dignity in a neighborhood of people who accept him with understanding, respect and friendship.

Article the sixth—to receive help in overcoming deprivation or whatever distortion in his emotional, physical, intellectual, social and spiritual growth may have resulted from his early experiences.

Article the seventh—to receive education, training, and career guidance to prepare him for a useful and satisfying life.

Article the eighth—to receive preparation for citizenship and parenthood through interaction with foster parents and other adults who are consistent role models.

Article the ninth—to be represented by an attorney at law in administrative or judicial proceedings with access to fair hearings and court review of decisions; so that his best interests are safeguarded.

Article the tenth—to receive a high quality of child welfare services, including involve-

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

ment of the natural parents and his own in major decisions that affect his life.

Attest:

BRUCE H. MALLOTT,  
Chairman, National Action for Foster Children Committee.

Mrs. JAMES M. COX,  
Member, National Action for Foster Children Committee.

FREDERICK GREEN, M.D.  
Associate Chief, Children's Bureau.

**AIRCRAFT AND AIRPORT NOISE**

**Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to the RECORD a copy of a statement that Senator JOHN TUNNEY of California recently gave to the Environmental Law Institute of the American Bar Association.

This statement, given on the first anniversary of the Noise Control Act of 1972, addresses the issue of preemption under various sections of the above law. I believe it is especially important to recognize, as Senator TUNNEY makes clear, that the Supreme Court has held in a recent decision that the Noise Control Act does in fact preempt State and local governments with regard to the regulation of aircraft and airport noise.

The effect of the decision in Burbank against Lockheed Air Terminal, which struck down a local ordinance imposing a curfew on Burbank Airport, is to leave something of a regulatory vacuum as far as noise control is concerned. While the Court has left the regulation of aircraft and airport noise chiefly in the hands of the Federal Aviation Authority, the FAA has been slow to move in this area. Under the terms of the Noise Control Act, the FAA is required to consider noise control recommendations submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency. But the recommendations have not been forthcoming, nor has any deadline been set for either their submission by EPA or their ultimate consideration by FAA.

EPA has recently completed a 9-month study of aircraft and airport noise and has indicated that it intends to make strong recommendations. Without any deadline, however, EPA has also indicated that it may not be able to submit all its proposals for up to a year.

Earlier this summer, Representative JOHN MOSS of California and I, together with a number of cosponsors, introduced legislation—H.R. 9707—which would establish a deadline for EPA to submit its recommendations. We are now working to expand the scope of the amendment to set a deadline for final action by the FAA as well.

It is of critical importance that EPA and FAA finally act on the very serious problem of aircraft and airport noise. With the Burbank decision upholding the doctrine of preemption in this area, the citizens of this country will be left without any kind of substantive relief until the above agencies do act or, more realistically, until the above agencies are required to act.

Noise pollution in general and airport noise in particular are threatening problems in metropolitan areas. As the recent EPA study reported, approximately 10 million Americans are now affected by aircraft and airport noise and that "in spite of the introduction of quieter new aircraft, the number of people affected will continue to be of major proportions until the mid-1980's unless aggressive action is taken."

We have studied this problem for years, and the time has come to finally grant relief to our citizens. We must, at the very least, avoid unnecessary bureaucratic delay. On behalf of our beleaguered urban residents, we can afford no less.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that Senator TUNNEY's statement be reprinted forthwith:

**NOISE CONTROL ACT OF 1972 ON FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS**

Good Morning. I am pleased to address this environmental conference on what is approximately the first anniversary of the Noise Control Act of 1972.

As most of you know, it took about two years to get the legislation through the Congress. The House passed a weak bill in February of 1972, and shortly thereafter I introduced in the Senate, with Senator MUSKIE, what we hoped was a far stronger piece of legislation. For the next seven months, intense negotiation and lobbying went on, and, finally, in the last days of the 92nd Congress, a very tough bill passed the Senate and a very adequate compromise was agreed upon with the House.

In my brief remarks today, I want to address the issue of pre-emption under various sections of the legislation. As this audience is well aware, the pre-emption provisions are a crucial determinant of the scope of regulatory and enforcement authority available to cities, states and the federal government. The pre-emption provisions in the Noise Control Act differ for each of the three basic parts of the regulatory approach. First, for new products.

The legislation provides that, within two years of enactment, after the publication by the Environmental Protection Agency of the effects on the health and welfare of differing quantities and qualities of noise, and after opportunity for public participation, EPA must publish noise regulations for major noise sources. Once these regulations are prescribed (not just proposed), cities and states are pre-empted from setting any but identical standards with respect to the products involved. This means that a state or city might enact a law which sets an identical noise emission level, but provides stricter penalties for violation. The section goes on to state that states and cities are free to regulate levels of environmental noise even if those regulations result in restricting the operation or use of a product for which federal standards have been set. Permissible regulatory techniques include restrictions on licensing, use, operation or movement of products.

For example, according to the Senate report, states and localities can set speed or load limits or prohibit use in given areas or during given hours. They can set quantitative limits on environmental noise in an area and enforce those limits against any source in the area. They can restrict noise at the boundary of a construction site or regulate noise as a nuisance.

In California, for example, six different types of laws aimed at reducing vehicular noise, which are in force at this time, are not inconsistent with the pre-emption provisions of the Noise Control Act. These include on-the-road vehicle noise limits simi-

lar to speed limits (vehicle code sections 23130 and 23130.5), a prohibition against the sale of new motor vehicles exceeding stated noise limit (vehicle code section 27160), muffler requirements (vehicle code sections 27150 and 27151), requirements for certification of motor vehicle exhaust systems based on noise (vehicle code section 27150.1 and 25150.7), certification of tires based on noise (vehicle code section 27502 through 27503) and an extensive registration and noise control system for off-highway vehicles (vehicle code sections 38000 through 38300).

The only one of these laws which may be interfered with once the new product standards set by the EPA become effective is vehicle code section 27160 prohibiting the sale of new motor vehicles exceeding stated motor noise limits. If EPA's noise limit for new motor vehicles is different from the stated noise limits in the California law, then the noise limit in the California law will be invalid. If the EPA limit is identical to the California limit, then California law will not be invalid.

The second basic part of the regulatory approach in the legislation concerns aircraft and airport noise.

Under section 7, EPA is to make a nine-month study of the adequacy of existing efforts to control aircraft noise, implications of identifying and achieving levels of cumulative noise exposure, and additional measure available to aircraft operators and local governments in order to control noise. Based on the study, EPA must submit proposed regulations to the FAA which are necessary to protect the public health and welfare. The FAA must publish these recommendations, and, after opportunity for public comment, it must accept or modify them. Review of the FAA's action is available to EPA and the public.

There are no pre-emption sections whatsoever in the parts of the legislation concerning aircraft and airport noise. The intent here, as expressly stated in the Senate and House reports, was that "no provision of the bill is intended to alter, in any way, the relationship between the authority of the federal government and that of state and local governments that existed with respect to matters covered by section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act prior to the enactment of the bill."

We thought our statement of intent was clear; we intended *not* to address the issue of pre-emption. Nonetheless, in briefs before the Supreme Court on a case then pending, one side argued that by not including a pre-emption clause we intended not to pre-empt, and the other side argued that we intended to re-emphasize the fact that the federal government had preempted, in all respects, the regulation of aircraft in flight. The case was *City of Burbank v. Lockheed Air Terminal*, and the basic issue was whether the imposition of a curfew on Burbank Airport by the City of Burbank (which was not the airport proprietor) was a proper exercise of that City's police power and was not pre-empted by federal regulations of aircraft and airport noise. In a 5 to 4 decision issued last May, the Supreme Court held that, indeed, we *did* intend to pre-empt and cited sections of floor debate on the bill. (*City of Burbank v. Lockheed Air Terminal*, 411 US 624 (1973).)

The *Burbank* result is disappointing because it has created a regulatory vacuum. States like California which have strong legislation concerning aircraft and airport noise now find their laws enjoined by the courts. City and airport authorities fear substantial liability by virtue of damage suits filed by residents around noisy airports (for example, the Los Angeles International Airport) but claim they have no regulatory means to reduce their liability and to help solve the problem.

The federal government could act, but hasn't. Until the pressure generated upon

it by virtue of the passage of the Noise Control Act, the FAA had regulations to reduce noise of only 2% of the current commercial fleet. Since October of last year, some new proposals have been made. For example, the FAA promulgated a rule to ban overflights of supersonic aircraft at supersonic speeds but not to lower noise levels from such aircraft when they fly subsonically. The FAA has also indicated that it favors regulating fleet noise levels, but it proposes to exclude from such regulation aircraft engaged in "foreign and overseas commerce" which means that the majority of noisy 707's and DC-8's will not be covered. Just last week, the FAA indicated that new aircraft of old types (E.G., 707's) should meet its part 36 noise levels, but this proposal still fails to cover the majority of commercial aircraft now flying.

I am convinced that the FAA will not take sufficient action until it is forced to. The Noise Control Act provides a mechanism to force the FAA to act, once EPA makes its recommendations. EPA has now completed its nine-month study of the problem and has indicated that it intends to make strong recommendations. Unfortunately, the legislation does not set a deadline for making these recommendations, and EPA now wants to delay doing so until next year. I am hopeful that pressure from the Congress and the public will speed up the process, or that an amendment to the legislation to set a deadline will pass the Congress.

The *third* basic part of the legislation concerns interstate carriers.

Here, the legislation provides virtually total pre-emption for standards covering both new and old products. Standards are to be promulgated by EPA within nine months of the enactment of the law, after consultation with the Department of Transportation, and must reflect the best available technology, taking into account the cost of compliance. EPA has proposed standards for motor carriers, but standards for railroads have been delayed. In contrast to the aircraft area where the industry has lobbied against more regulation, here, pressure to enact regulations comes from the various industries to be regulated which fear extraordinary costs and burdens from being forced to accept a multiplicity of state and local regulations. In the case of railroads, however, it is argued that we do not yet have technology sufficient to do the job needed. I would emphasize that a prime purpose of the legislation was to push technology, and that pressure must be kept on EPA to meet its statutory obligations.

A discussion of pre-emption under the legislation would not be complete without mentioning section 5(a)(2), which requires that, within one year of enactment, EPA is to complete a report on the levels of environmental noise requisite to protect the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety. This is a key document because, under the legislation, states and cities are left absolutely free to regulate levels of environmental noise. The document, then, can serve as an important tool to aid states in cities in formulating legislation.

It was the intent of the Congress that this document specify maximum levels of noise exposure, and not just approximate levels. A range of only a few decibels can mean as much as a 100 percent increase or decrease in the amount of noise. The concept of "protecting the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety" implies that every sector of the population which could reasonably be exposed to such noise levels, even medically susceptible individuals, should be protected. Consideration of economics and technological feasibility should not figure in the establishment of these maximum levels but should be factors which the state and local governments should consider in determining when and in what areas these protective levels should be attained.

On October 2, 1973, in order to clarify confusion about the intent of section 5(a)(2) which arose at an oversight hearing held by the Senate Commerce and Public Works Committees a week earlier, I sent a letter to David D. Dominick, then EPA's Assistant Administrator for Hazardous Control. In that letter, I stated the Committees' understanding of the legislative intent and it is my understanding that the letter arrived in the knick of time to prevent an effort at some levels in the agency to gut the "levels" document. That document was due last week—on October 27th. It has been delayed, but the draft I have seen does comply with the legislative intent.

In conclusion, we seem to be well on the way to coordinating federal, state and local noise regulations. The basic problem at this point is the regulatory vacuum concerning aircraft and airport noise. The ever-present threat of liability should keep sufficient heat on the FAA to force stronger regulations in the near future. Should existing legislation prove inadequate, I am prepared to introduce additional legislation. States like California will pursue their remedies in court and may succeed in enforcing their own laws, at least until such time as federal regulation is adequate.

Just as noise is a subtle pollutant (in the sense that it is invisible and its effects often do not become apparent until some time after the cause has dissipated), so the regulation of noise is also subtle. The attempt was made in the Noise Control Act to provide a mix of remedies at federal, state and local levels. That attempt will only succeed if efforts are made at each of these levels to pass strong and effective legislation and to enforce that legislation. I will continue to do what I can at the federal level, and I ask each of you—in your private and public capacities—to help.

#### PERSONAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

### HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I enter into the RECORD a statement of the assets and liabilities of my wife and I as of December 31, 1973:

Assets (as of December 31, 1973):	
Savings account.....	\$331.18
Cash on hand in checking accounts.....	200.00
Personal notes due us.....	23,151.83
1971 Camaro, 1969 Ford, and 1965 Mustang.....	3,075.00
Real Estate:	
House in Furlong.....	50,000.00
House in Washington.....	78,000.00
Stocks and Bonds:	
6 shares, Xerox.....	736.50
12 shares, ATT.....	601.50
Bucks Republican Headquarters, Inc. bond.....	1,000.00
Household goods and miscellaneous personal property.....	12,000.00
U.S. Civil Service Retirement Fund.....	20,835.00
Total assets.....	194,631.10
Liabilities (as of December 31, 1973):	
Mortgages and loans secured on real property:	
House in Furlong.....	19,661.46
House in Washington.....	41,385.99
Installment loan on car.....	271.64
Personal notes and loans.....	7,262.96
Total liabilities.....	68,582.05

During 1972, in addition to my congressional income, I received \$75 in honoraria, \$1,891 in installment payments on interest-bearing notes—the principal of which is capital gain—and dividend income amounting to less than \$100. I expect 1973 figures to be substantially similar.

I am pleased to join with my other colleagues who also have disclosed statements of their personal finances. As a cosponsor of financial disclosure legislation, it is my hope that the House and Senate will enact such a measure during the current session.

LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT:  
JANUARY 1974

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, periodically, I enter into the RECORD a status report on legislation I have sponsored. Following is such a report covering all legislation I sponsored during the first session of the 93d Congress:

LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT, JANUARY 1974  
AGRICULTURE

H.R. 5683. (Denholm): Funds REA Emergency Loan Program (Enacted as PL 93-32).

H.R. 3077 (Dellums): Limits procurement of lettuce by the Department of Defense.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

H.R. 8770 (Nedzi): Establish Folklife Center in Library of Congress.

ASIAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 3086 (Dellums): Japanese-American Friendship Act.

BUDGET

H.R. 8897 (Rangel): Make full appropriations for OEO.

CHILD WELFARE

H.R. 3081 (Dellums): Comprehensive Child Care Services.

H.R. 2573 (Dellums): Requires child-care facilities in low rent housing projects.

H.R. 6379 (Schroeder): Establish National Center on Child Development and Abuse Prevention within HEW (Passed both Houses; now in conference).

H.R. 8270 (Daniels): Youth Camp Safety Act.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

H.R. 2572 (Dellums): Defines the authority of armed forces to gather intelligence.

H.R. 2577 (Dellums): Government must notify individuals of records kept by government agencies.

H.R. 2578 (Dellums): Limits the sale of mailing lists by federal agencies.

H.R. 2579 (Dellums): Amends the Hatch Act.

H.R. 2581 (Dellums): Lowers juror age from 21 to 18 in federal courts.

H.R. 2582 (Dellums): Gun control.

H.R. 2584 (Dellums): Newsmen privilege (Similar bill, H.R. 5928 to be reported in lieu).

H.R. 3100 (Dellums) Amnesty.

H.R. 3520 (Waldie) Protects confidential sources of news media—Similar bill H.R. 5928 to be reported in lieu.

H.R. 4209 (Diggs) Safeguards Americans abroad from discrimination.

H.R. 5592 (Drinan) Abolishes capital punishment.

H.R. 7796 (Dellums) Better Voting Act (postcard registration passed Senate, pending in House).

H.R. 9480 (Kastenmeier): Voting rights for former convicts.

H.R. 10182 (Stark): Protection of financial information.

H.R. 11275 (Goldwater): Code of Fair Information Practices Act.

H.J. Res. 217 (Dellums) Lowers age requirement for membership in Congress.

H.J. Res. 242 (Brown) Gives Members of Congress the right to sue for impoundment of funds.

H.J. Res. 200 (Delugo) Allow citizens of Guam and the Northern Islands to vote for President and Vice-President.

H. Res. 556 (Dellums) Constitutional amendment giving Congress power to change election laws.

COMMERCE

H.R. 8288 (Stark) Allow co-ops to receive SBA assistance.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

H.R. 3385 (Dellums) All Congressional and agency meetings open to public.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

H.R. 2412 (Rosenthal): Establishes Office of Consumer Affairs.

H.R. 2580 (Dellums): Requires licensing of food manufacturers and processors.

H.R. 3093 (Dellums): Consumers class action rights.

H.R. 3096 (Dellums): Bans war toys.

H.R. 4879 (Udall): Full disclosure on land sales (Included in Senate bill now pending in House).

H.R. 8436 (O'Hara): Prohibit weaker State meat inspection standards (Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains completed hearings).

H.R. 11460 (Brown of Cal.): Banks and Savings & Loans pay interest on escrow accounts.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

H.R. 6316 (Danielson): Create Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation.

H.R. 7547 (Dellums): Eucalyptus tree fire danger assistance. (Reported by Agriculture Committee; Rules defeated on House floor.)

H.R. 7926 (Stark): Disaster Relief Act Assistance for Seventh District.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

H.R. 2574 (Dellums): Statehood for D.C.

H.R. 5598 (Fauntroy): Rent control for the District of Columbia. (Signed into law as PL 93-157.)

H.R. 9470 (Dellums): Autonomous elected Board of Education for the District of Columbia. (Hearings started by subcommittee on Education.)

H.R. 9682 (Diggs): Home Rule for the District of Columbia. (Signed into law as P.L. 93-198.)

H.R. 11108 (Diggs): Extend D.C. Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970.

H.R. 11238 (Gude): Subsidized adoption program for D.C. (Signed into law as P.L. 93-241.)

DRUGS

H.R. 3103 (Dellums): Prohibits the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products.

H.R. 3382 (Dellums): Regulates interstate sale and trafficking of hypodermic needles.

H.R. 7051 (Dellums): Prohibits aid to foreign countries who produce drugs.

H.R. 10732 (Owens): Amends F.D.A. vitamin labeling regulations. (Commerce Committee hearings underway.)

EDUCATION

H.R. 3082 (Dellums): Grants to Deganwidah-Quetzalcotal University.

H.R. 3085 (Dellums): Encourages States to increase proportion of expenditures to public education.

H.R. 3378 (Dellums): Provides instructional services for homebound children.

H.J. Res. 810 (Dellums): National Education Policy. (Adopted as part of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1974).

H.J. Res. 851 (Badillo): Authorize President to proclaim week of May 13, 1974 as Bilingual Education Week.

EMPLOYMENT

H.R. 1490 (Eckhardt): Amends Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

H.R. 2585 (Dellums): Unemployment insurance for agricultural workers.

H.R. 2586 (Dellums): Extends unemployment insurance for agricultural workers.

H.R. 3083 (Dellums): Day laborer's rights.

H.R. 3110 (Dellums): Assigns unused lab space to unemployed scientists.

H.R. 3112 (Dellums): Pension Rights.

H.R. 3986 (Hawkins): Public Service employment programs.

H.R. 5401 (Corman): Unemployment insurance for agricultural workers.

H.R. 5706 (Hawkins): Aid for OIC programs.

H.R. 6161 (McFall): Establishes price wage board and guidelines.

H.R. 7224 (Harrington): Federal Security of Employment Benefits.

H.R. 7225 (Harrington): Improve extended unemployment and compensation program.

H.R. 7964 (Mink): Equalize compensation of overseas teachers.

H.R. 8372 (Heinz): Reallocation of vocational rehabilitation funds.

H.R. 8420 (Harrington): Public Service Employment Act.

H.R. 9699 (Abzug): Flexible Hours Employment Act.

H.R. 10970 (Dellums): Eliminate employment discrimination because of type of military discharge.

H.J. Res. 243 (Harrington): Increases House of Representatives intern programs.

ENERGY

H.R. 5234 (Kastenmeier): Prevents coal companies from owning all energy sources.

H.R. 8068 (Aspin): Continued gas sales to independent retailers.

H.R. 8802 (Burton): Percentage of oil imports must be carried on U.S. ships.

H.R. 9095 (Owens): Recycling of waste products.

H.R. 9364 (Fraser): Amend Interstate Commerce Act to prevent oil companies from owning pipelines.

H.R. 10299 (Ashley): Improving motor vehicle fuel economy.

H.R. 10542 (Dingell): Assuring adequate fuel supplies.

H.R. 11496 (Aspin): Directs President to halt exports of fuel oils.

ENVIRONMENT

H.R. 2677 (Hechler): Strip Mining Act. (Similar H.R. 3 to be reported in lieu).

H.R. 3076 (Dellums): Safe Pesticide Act.

H.R. 3092 (Dellums): Smogless Vehicles Development Act.

H.R. 3095 (Dellums): Emissions Control Act.

H.R. 3097 (Dellums): Amends National Emission Standards Act to require most stringent standards.

H.R. 3101 (Dellums): Regulates dumping in oceans and other waters.

H.R. 3102 (Dellums): Provides for environmental action suits.

H.R. 3104 (Dellums): Increases penalties under 1899 Refuse Act.

H.R. 3105 (Dellums): Amends Refuse Act of 1899 relating to issuance of certain permits.

H.R. 3106 (Dellums): Provides for assistance in enforcing clean air and water standards.

H.R. 3107 (Dellums): Synthetic Detergent Study.

H.R. 3388 (Dellums): Establishes Desert Pupfish National Monument.

H.R. 5325 (Dellums): Establishes a National Environmental Trust Fund.  
H.R. 8530 (Udall): Alaskan Petroleum Transportation Act. (Weaker P.L. 93-153 signed into law.)

H.R. 8889 (Koch): Spaying and neutering clinics.

H.R. 9583 (Patman): Fire Prevention and Control Act.

H.R. 9866 (Bafalis): Deauthorization of cross Florida Barge Canal.

H.J. Res. 763 (Matsunaga): Set aside of EPA water pollution regulations.

#### FOOD STAMPS

H.R. 2571 (Dellums): Allows food stamps to be used for purchase of imported meats.

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

H.R. 179 (Dellums): Halt bombing and withdraw from Vietnam.

H.R. 3911 (Mills): Prohibits most-favored nation treatment for denial of right to emigrate. (Included in trade bill now pending in Senate.)

H.R. 4987 (Roybal): Increases immigration.

H.R. 5741 (Roybal): Increases immigration from western hemisphere.

H.R. 8005 (Fraser): Re-institution of Rhodesian chrome ore boycott sanctions. (Reported by subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements).

H.R. 8177 (Harrington): Cut off war funds in Cambodia and Laos.

H.R. 8573 (Rangel): Herbicide Export Control Act.

H.R. 8574 (Rangel): Prohibit exports of herbicide to Portugal and S. Africa.

H.R. 8965 (Steiger): Citizenship and adoption for S. Vietnamese children.

H.R. 9214 (Kastenmeier): Accountability and liability for government officials involved in national security policy.

H.R. 10588 (Matsunaga): Creates Department of Peace.

H. Res. 441 (Harrington): Test Ban Treaty Negotiations.

H. Res. 498 (Gude): Prohibition of weather modification in war.

H. Res. 522 (Diggs): Fair employment in South Africa.

H. Res. 523 (Fraser): Diplomatic relations between U.S. and Sweden. (Approved by subcommittee on Europe).

H. Res. 616 (O'Neill): Phantom Jet sales to Israel.

H.J. Res. 268 (Diggs): Fair employment in South African enterprises.

H.J. Res. 516 (Bingham): To end the war in Indochina. (Subcommittee of Asian and Pacific Affairs conducting hearings).

#### GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

H.R. 2576 (Dellums): Amends Age Discrimination Act to include state employees.

H.R. 3296 (Pickle): Impoundment limits (similar bill, H.R. 8430, passed by House.)

H.R. 3379 (Dellums): Expands the Advisory Committee on Intergovernment Relations to include school board officials.

H.R. 5398 (Conyers): Prevent dismantling of OEO.

H.R. 5587 (Conyers): Prevent dismantling of OEO.

H.R. 5626 (Reid): Eliminates restrictions on social service regulations.

H.R. 5722 (Melcher): Consent needed for OMB Director. (Vetoed by President. Revised version S. 37 now in conference.)

H.R. 6223 (Dellums): Bureaucratic Accountability Act.

H.R. 6261 (Mink): Amends Freedom of Information Act.

H.R. 7266 (Mitchell): Put protective police under GSA.

H.R. 7696 (Dellums): Federal Employee benefits retirement amendments. (Reported by subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Mail).

H.R. 7697 (Dellums): Postal Reorganization Act Amendments.

H.R. 7698 (Dellums): Postal Service Labor relations amendment.

H.R. 12004 (Moorhead): Amendments on classification of government documents.

H. Res. 148 (Dellums): Abolishes Committee on Internal Security.

H.J. Res. 432 (Reid): Social Service program regulations.

#### HEALTH

H.R. 6041 (Hastings): Health Programs Extension (signed) into laws as PL 93-45).

H.R. 6622 (Waldie): Extension of Migrant Health Act.

H.R. 8539 (Murphy): Continuation of Public Health Service Hospitals.

H.R. 9363 (Burke of Calif.): Expand the definition of "Development Disability" to include autism.

#### HOLIDAYS

H.R. 2265 (Conyers): Designates Martin Luther King's birthday as legal holiday.

#### HOUSING

H.R. 3080 (Dellums): Authorizes loans to pay mortgages of persons temporarily unemployed.

H.R. 10902 (Stephens): Rural Housing Act.

#### IMPEACHMENT

H. Res. 465 (Stark): Study by House Committee of Watergate.

H. Res. 650 (Abzug): Impeachment.

H.J. Res. 784 (Culver): Appoint special prosecutor for floor vote. (Similar H.R. 11401 to be reported in lieu).

#### LEGAL SERVICES/COURT REFORMS

H.R. 3099 (Dellums): Provides compensation for victims of violent crimes.

H.R. 4263 (Meeds): Establishes the National Legal Services Corporation (weaker bill enacted as PL 93-95).

H.R. 8349 (Roybal): Provide bi-lingual court proceedings.

#### MILITARY AFFAIRS

H.R. 3111 (Dellums): Increases servicemen's group life insurance coverage.

H.R. 3224 (Benitez): Terminates weapons range activities near Culebra. (Defense Department registered official objection).

H.R. 3386 (Dellums): Provides veterans with up to nine months of educational assistance and refresher courses. (Subcommittee hearings held).

H.R. 4751 (Danielson): Social Security benefit increases disregard for purposes of determining eligibility for veterans benefits.

H.R. 7695 (Dellums): Establishes Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equal Opportunity.

H.R. 7794 (Dellums): Bans bounties paid civilian police forces.

H.R. 8490 (Koch): Changes in military discharge information released to public.

H.R. 8491 (Koch): Independent Review Boards for discharges.

H.R. 8492 (Koch): Increased veterans educational benefits.

H.R. 8494 (Koch): Additional educational benefits for Vietnam vets.

H.R. 8496 (Koch): Establishes Vietnam era veterans task force.

H.R. 8687 (Leggett): Special pay incentives for physicians, dentists, veterinarians and optometrists.

H.R. 8719 (Dellums): Overseas troop reduction limitation.

H.R. 8960 (Robison): Establish within Peace Corps Vietnam Assistance Volunteers program.

H.R. 10011 (Owens): Controls transportation of nerve gas.

H.R. 10882 (Abzug): Psychiatric help for Vietnam veterans.

H.R. 11267 (Du Pont): No sex discrimination in Military Academy appointments.

H.R. 12144 (Stokes): Limitations on information on discharge certificates.

H. Res. 220 (Kyros): Troop reduction in western Europe. (Hearings being conducted by Subcommittee on Europe.)

H. Res. 528 (Owens): Detoxification of nerve gas by DOD.

H. Res. 712 (Owens): Review of national policy regarding chemical warfare.

H. Con. Res. 253 (Dellums): Overseas troop reduction limitation.

H.J. Res. 267 (Dellums): Clarifies presidential powers relating to the use of nuclear weapons in declared or undeclared wars. (Weaker H.J. Res. 542 vetoed by President and overridden by House; now law as PL 93-148.)

#### MOTOR VEHICLES

H.R. 3091 (Dellums): Bans the use of internal combustion engines in motor vehicles after Jan. 1, 1975.

H.R. 3094 (Dellums): Speed Controls in cars.

H.R. 3108 (Dellums): Color coded traffic signs and signals.

#### NATIVE AMERICANS

H.R. 3090 (Dellums): Enforces Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

H. Con. Res. 115 (Meeds): American and Alaskan Native Act.

#### PENAL REFORM

H.R. 2583 (Dellums): Omnibus Penal Reform Act.

H.R. 5202 (Badillo): Provides rules for treatment of prisoners in federal prisons.

H.R. 6852 (Dellums): Prohibits psychosurgery in federal facilities.

#### POPULATION POLICY

H.R. 3381 (Dellums): Expands family planning services and population research.

H.R. 6021 (Dellums): Extension of Family Planning Act.

H.R. 8114 (Brown): Establish National Institute of Population Sciences.

#### PUBLIC LANDS

H.R. 3087 (Dellums): 160 acre limit enactment.

H.R. 7458 (Dellums): Channel Islands National Park.

H.R. 3088 (Dellums): Open Beach Act.

H.R. 3089 (Dellums): Mineral King: enlarges Sequoia National Park.

H.R. 4012 (Leggett): Snow Mountain Wilderness Bill.

H.R. 4568 (Waldie): San Joaquin Wilderness and Sierra and Inyo National Forests.

H.R. 5288 (Mathias): Establishes California Desert National Conservation Area.

H.R. 9764 (Pettis): Protection of California desert areas.

H.J. Res. 204 (Dingell): Establishes Tule Elk Wildlife Refuge.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

H.R. 3084 (Dellums): Establishes older worker community service program.

H.R. 3098 (Dellums): Free of reduced rail transportation to handicapped or 65 and over.

H.R. 3377 (Dellums): Strengthens Older Americans Act (Enacted as P.L. 93-17).

H.R. 3388 (Dellums): Widow, Widower benefits bill.

H.R. 7052 (Dellums): Tax credit for senior citizen homeowners and renters.

H.R. 8595 (Lehman): Experimental program of elderly home care.

H.R. 11122 (Pepper): Nutrition programs for the elderly.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3116 (Dellums): Include qualified drugs under Hospital Insurance Program.

H.R. 3117 (Dellums): Individuals may qualify regardless of quarters when earned.

H.R. 3118 (Dellums): Liberalizes eligibility for blind persons.

H.R. 5258 (Stokes): Disability insurance benefits.

H.R. 8546 (Abzug): Minimum annual incomes.

H.R. 10236 (Rosenthal): Increase Social Security benefits enacted by public law. (Enacted into law as P.L. 93-233).

H.R. 10584 (DeLugo): Social Security increases for Guam and the Virgin Islands.

H.R. 11169 (Corman): Give states wide range for social service funds.

H.R. 11276 (Goldwater): Limit use of Social Security number and information.

H.R. 11471 (Grasso): Limit Medicare in-patient hospital deductible costs.

SPORTS

H.R. 2575 (Dellums): Athletic Safety Act.  
H.R. 7083 (Badillo): Roberto Clemente Memorial Foundation.

H.R. 7795 (Dellums): Athletic Care Act. (Education and Labor Committee adopted amendment to Elementary and Secondary Education Act calling for one year study of athletic injury problem).

H. Res. 487 (Anderson of Calif.): Honoring Hank Aaron.

TAXES

H.R. 1041 (Corman): Tax equity.  
H.R. 3113 (Dellums): Expenses for care of certain dependents.

H.R. 3114 (Dellums): Excise tax on fuels containing sulphur.

H.R. 3115 (Dellums): Increases personal exemptions after 1974.

H.R. 3120 (Dellums): Extends to unmarried persons tax benefits of splitting income.

H.R. 3387 (Dellums): Residents of Philippines can be claimed as tax-deductible dependents.

H.R. 6030 (Fraser): Puts \$1 campaign tax check-off on front page of tax form.

H.R. 7053 (Dellums): World Peace Tax Fund.

TRANSPORTATION

H.R. 3078 (Dellums): Urban mass transit fund.

H.R. 3079 (Dellums): Oakland-Chinatown project.

H.R. 8570 (Moss): Defining inclusive tour air charters.

H.R. 10155 (Burke of Cal.): High speed West coast ground transportation.

URBAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 3109 (Dellums): Construction of bicycle lanes.

H.R. 3985 (Hawkins): Year round recreational program for youth.

H.R. 4820 (McFall): Extends Public Works Act authorization for one year (similar bill H.R. 2246 enacted as PL 93-46.)

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

H.R. 3374 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination by sex or marital status for extension of credit (Enacted by Senate; House action pending.)

H.R. 3375 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination by sex or marital status for any dealings with any federally insured banks.

H.R. 3376 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination by sex or marital status regarding federally related mortgage transactions.

H.R. 3383 (Dellums): Prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

H.R. 3384 (Dellums): The Ms. prefix bill.

H.R. 9776 (Abzug): Postage stamp honoring Jeannette Rankin.

TO MY FATHER

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TO MY FATHER

WHO IS MY FATHER?

The man who wanted to slay the cow that flipped his six-year old; the early morning riser, who helped when the newspapers were too heavy.

The Counsellor, Companion, Friend, and most of all, "Father," who tenderly guided the hand of the boy; protected his youth, encouraged his growth, and loved his development.

Who watched with admiration, the transition of the boy to the man.

Ever available, ever giving of that love, strength, gentle chastisement, and unending support.

Criticism with care, love with forgiveness, and an unflinching trust that binds father to son, and man to man, forever.

The "Man" who gave when there was nothing to give; the "Anchor" when seas were rough; the "Believer" when he stood alone; the "Generator" when the spirits were low.

The "Man" who became the "Father," who gave to the son, the love, strength, guidance, and inner tranquility that maketh the son . . . "The Man."

Dr. CHRISTOPHER C. DOTSON, Jr.

ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS UNDER THE HOME RULE ACT FOR WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in another year when the newly elected City Council for Washington, D.C., has taken office, another feature of the home rule law will start coming into prominence. The City Council will start dividing the city into neighborhood areas and providing for elections in each area for Advisory Neighborhood Councils.

This feature, provided in section 738 of the Home Rule Act, will help the Council and other city officials get from each neighborhood a grassroots input into decisions of the city government.

A thoughtful leader of neighborhood affairs in Washington, D.C., Mr. Gregory New, first vice president of the District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations, Inc., has some challenging suggestions for the new City Council when it comes to implement this part of the law. Mr. New suggests that besides identifying boundaries for each neighborhood, the Council should use neighborhood boundaries to redraw precinct, ward, and service area lines.

The great interest in this grassroots democracy portion of the home rule law is heartening. Full operation of neighborhood councils is still 2 or more years away, but it is not too early for active discussion of their role and the best ways to implement this part of the Home Rule Act.

The material follows:

OUTLINE ON ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS

(By Gregory New)

The DC Self-Government and Government Reorganization Act authorizes the establishment of a system of Advisory Neighborhood Councils, provided a majority of the registered qualified voters in the District vote for such Councils May 7.

Section 738 of the Act provides:

1. The elected District Council shall divide Washington into neighborhood council areas.
2. Advisory Neighborhood Councils shall be established in such areas upon petition

signed by 5% of the registered voters in the respective areas.

3. Neighborhood elections shall be conducted by the Board of Elections, shall coincide with Board of Education elections, and shall be nonpartisan.

4. Neighborhood Council members shall be elected from single member districts.

5. Each council must be given timely notice of all requested or proposed zoning changes, variances, public improvements, licenses or permits of significance to neighborhood planning and development within its area.

6. Each established neighborhood council shall be funded according to a minimum formula amounting to about 50 cents per year for each resident.

7. Neighborhood Councils may receive additional financing as voted by the District Council, and such other public and private funds as may be offered to them.

It is critical, however, to draw Neighborhood Council Areas that mean something to the communities concerned. This will not be easy, because of overlapping concepts of neighborhoods.

The Act provides that the District Council "shall consider natural geographic boundaries, election districts, and divisions of the District made for the purposes of administration of services." However, wards and precincts are rather arbitrary in the way they cut across neighborhoods. The present Service Areas have boundaries somewhat distorted out of respect to the Model Cities Neighborhood, which is purely the creation of just one program.

In as much as the language of the Act in this respect is not mandatory, perhaps it would be more in keeping with the spirit of the Act to reverse the consideration. First define the natural neighborhoods, then build the election districts and service areas around them. Under such a plan:

A. The City Council should draw neighborhood council areas first, sorting out neighborhood loyalties with the best advice available from present neighborhood groups.

B. The Council should then direct the Board of Elections to draw a new system of precincts uniform in population, which will respect the neighborhood boundaries.

C. In as much as Neighborhood Councils shall have single member constituencies, the City Council should then determine in each area how precincts shall relate to the councilmanic districts. In the smaller neighborhoods the precincts might be further divided into two or more councilmanic districts. In medium sized neighborhoods they may correspond to the councilmanic districts, while in the large neighborhoods the precincts could be combined into larger councilmanic districts. In any case, neighborhood council voting should be in the regular precinct polling places, and the relation between precinct and councilmanic district must be easy to bear in mind.

D. After the Board of Elections completes its new precinct map, it should then redraw the ward boundaries, to respect the various neighborhood council areas as far as is consistent with equal representation.

E. Once neighborhood council areas are established, the City Council should retool the service Area system to fit the neighborhoods. In some sections of the city the council areas may correspond closely to existing service areas, in other sections a group of two or more may come very close to constituting a present service area. However, it is quite possible that some neighborhood council areas recommended by the citizens will show no respect to present service areas. In each case the service area boundaries should be changed so that no neighborhood served by a single official advisory council shall be divided between service areas.

Two additional thoughts come to mind:

F. Once the structure of precincts, neighborhood councilmanic districts, neighborhood council areas, and service areas is com-

pleted, consideration should be given to crowning the edifice with a permanent city-wide advisory organization along the lines of the present DC Bicentennial Assembly. Experience suggests that such a group has a constructive role to play which does not undercut the legislative function proper to the fulltime City Council.

G. Everything possible should be done to strengthen the identification of Neighborhood Councils with the respective neighborhoods. A role of some sort should be found for long established groups in the area: civic associations, PTA's, ministerial councils, community action organizations, youth, senior citizens, business organizations, etc. Once everybody has been brought together, every effort must be made to discourage federal agencies from coming in with funding to create rival structures aiming to reach all the people.

### SCHOOL SYSTEM DRAWS UP ITS OWN ENERGY-SAVING PLAN

#### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in remarks last session I shared with my colleagues the plans of the Mountain View School System to establish their own energy saving program. Their plans have been drawn up and are the culmination of efforts by the student body, the faculty, and the administration of the school.

These efforts represent a realization that the solution to the energy crisis lies in the hands of all individuals. If each American is willing to voluntarily share some of the sacrifices required, then no one segment of our society will be forced to suffer undue hardships because of a lack of fuel.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert a copy of the report compiled by the Student Council of the Mountain View Public School concerning the energy crisis. I think it can serve as a model and incentive to all schools, businesses, and families.

The report follows:

#### ENERGY CRISIS

(Report by the student council of the Mountain View Public School concerning the energy crisis)

We, as a Student Council, realize the necessity of preparing for the up coming crisis concerning the nation's energy shortage. Please realize that we are not in a position to name the causes of the energy shortage. It is simply that we must adjust our way of life, and our methods of energy consumption, regardless of the reasons for the cut back. We are faced with one simple fact; there will not be enough energy supply to meet the demands of this nation, unless there is a cut back in consumption. We have been asked by our State Officials to help in public education in the conservation of energy.

We believe the following proposals and guidelines will not only conserve energy, but will result in a substantial savings financially.

#### Major areas of proposals

- I. Encourage more walking and bicycling, and less use of the automobile.
- II. Encourage conservation of the energy in the homes and businesses.
- III. Encourage conservation of energy at school.

IV. Prepare to meet the difficult months and problems of January and February especially if daylight savings time comes into effect.

#### AREA I. WALKING AND BICYCLING

A. Formation of a Bicycle Club including safety programs with officers and sponsors. Guidelines are listed below.

##### Elementary

1. The youngest student who should be able to ride a bicycle to school is a 4th grader.
2. Each grade elects officers for that grade.
3. Give safety films for the younger students. Give membership cards to each one.
4. Put up safety posters in classroom.

##### High School

1. Elect officers for Bicycle Club; President, Vice-President, etc.
2. Cut speed limit to a minimum during time of children transportation.
3. Give an award for the student who rides his or her bicycle the most number of times.
4. Purchase 2 bicycle racks: 1 for high school and 1 for elementary, each rack containing 20 slots.
5. The buses will not transport students who live in town. (This will save gas on buses and promote our Bicycle Club).

##### Advantages

1. Saves Gas.
2. Good physical exercise.
3. Saves money on bus stops.
4. Reduce crowding on buses.

##### Disadvantages

1. No sidewalks.
  2. Weather.
  3. Traffic hazards.
  4. Theft.
  5. No parking area.
  6. Psychological effect.
  7. Maintenance.
  8. Hard to carry books.
- B. This could be done only if the City Council adopt maximum speed limits that would be rigidly enforced during the times of school transit. (One hour in the morning and afternoon).

C. In order for this to be administered fairly, the school campus would need to be closed to student automobiles, except ones who could obtain permission from an appointed council of students and faculty advisors.

D. The Council recommends that school buses not stop within one mile of the school campus.

#### AREA II. CONSERVATION OF ENERGY AT HOME

Presently, our Council is working with the community leaders in compiling a list of suggestions on how to save energy at home. With the completion of this list, it will be made available to all the parents of our students, to all club presidents in the community, and to the newspapers. (See attached sheet)

#### AREA III. CONSERVATION OF ENERGY AT SCHOOL

- A. Energy Conservation in the building.
1. Place plastic sheets on all the windows to prevent heat loss.
  2. Keep the thermostat lowered to 65°.
  3. Keep the doors closed to all the rooms as much as possible.
  4. Check out the heating vents in all the rooms. Make sure they are working correctly.
  5. Turn the lights out on sunny days and shades should be raised to face the sun.
  6. Make sure no obstructions (books, coats, etc.) are over or in vents and stoves.
  7. Windows should be kept closed.
  8. Check into short-order lines in the lunchroom. (Cold plate type service)
  9. No more unscheduled activities in the gymnasium or lunch room after school hours unless approved by the School Board.
  10. Place springs on the elementary bathroom doors to keep the heat in.

11. Encourage teachers to not use lights on their Christmas Trees except during very short periods of time.

B. Gasoline conservation in automobiles.

1. The Student Council recommends that faculty members:

- a. Form car pools.
- b. Spouses come in one automobile.
- c. Ride the school bus.
- d. Walk.

This is a recommendation. We realize there will be exceptions.

C. The Student Council recommends that school buses:

1. Stop only at ¼ mile intervals, and not within 1 mile of the campus.
2. Be made available to classes and clubs for trips, if the organization can buy the gasoline at a station.
3. Be used as little as possible by the athletic department, with no additional athletic events being scheduled this year.

D. The Student Council recommends that all school personnel furnish gasoline when ever possible when using a school vehicle.

E. It will be among the Student Council's objectives to discourage parents from bringing their children to school in automobiles.

#### AREA IV. DIFFICULT MONTHS

Daylight savings time will mean if we begin classes 8:30 most of our bus students will be waiting on the bus long before daylight. We need to consider a different schedule.

The following is the Student Council proposal:

January & February schedule—42 days.

Period I 9:30-10:15.

II 10:20-11:05.

III 11:15-12:00.

IV 12:05-12:50.

Lunch 12:50-1:35.

V 1:40-2:25.

VI 2:30-3:15.

#### ADVANTAGES

1. Shortens school day 45 minutes. Saves nearly 4 hours of energy per week.
2. Helps bus students in early morning.
3. Still gives a reasonable dismissal time.
4. Lengthens lunch hour for High School.
5. All class lengths are legal, except lab classes.
6. Will make building less difficult to heat in early morning hours.

### ANTIETAM BATTLEFIELD PROTECTORS, INC.

#### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently a private organization was founded to provide protection for historic Antietam National Battlefield near Sharpsburg, Md. This important organization, Antietam Battlefield Protectors, Inc., was founded by a group of local citizens interested in preserving Antietam and its environs for posterity. The area has recently been threatened by development on the fringes of the existing National Battlefield Park.

The concept of Antietam Battlefield Protectors is simple and effective. People and organizations throughout the United States interested in preserving Antietam can donate to this charitable, nonprofit corporation, which will purchase land or easements from willing sellers. The goal is to raise \$10 to \$12 million so that land can be purchased at

prices competitive with the profits to be made from commercial development. Purchased land will be turned over to the National Park Service. Each donor will receive a certificate and his name will be inscribed in a book to be maintained at Antietam. For every \$2 donated, 1 square foot of land will be designated for an individual or organization.

Many national historic and environmental groups have joined Antietam Battlefield Protectors as honorary directors. There is an established need for protecting our proud heritage, and the incorporation of Antietam Battlefield Protectors is a great step in the direction of enhancing and preserving Antietam. I commend the ladies and gentlemen who have undertaken this task, and I know that Antietam Battlefield Protectors will be successful in this important endeavor.

REPORT TO COLORADO'S FIFTH DISTRICT

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of my January 1974 newsletter to residents of the Fifth Congressional District of Colorado:

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, COLORADO'S FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

JANUARY, 1974.

DEAR FRIENDS: Basic reform of Congress, the Executive branch, campaign practices, welfare and taxation must not be delayed any longer. Halfway measures will not be enough to restore the public's shaky faith in government.

Recently, I introduced legislation to outlaw many specific campaign abuses including political spying, sabotage, wiretapping, electronic surveillance and misuse of campaign funds. I will soon introduce bills to prevent improper use of tax returns; amend the Constitution to prevent unrelated legislative proposals from being hooked together; streamline congressional committee structure; improve scheduling; and provide for bi-partisan staffing.

I will continue to work for legislation to require a balanced budget and to prohibit backdoor spending and tax increases, and pay raises for congressmen and other public officials without a vote of Congress.

These reforms are important. But a fundamental change in attitudes of elected officials and the public is crucial.

Lately I've begun to hear from a lot of people who are fed up with the smugness and evasion that have been common in government recently . . . and fence-straddling, something-for-everybody, promise-anything-to-get-re-elected political tactics.

More and more people realize government can't solve all the nation's problems; some of the toughest can and should be the primary responsibility of the private sector and voluntary organizations; often government intervention makes things worse instead of better.

My mail and phone calls show a groundswell of popular support for basic government reform. Hopefully this will be a major trend of public opinion in 1974.

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

"History does not long entrust the care of freedom to the weak or timid . . . We must be willing, individually, and as a Nation, to accept whatever sacrifices may be required of us. A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both." Dwight D. Eisenhower.

CONGRESS ADJOURNS WITHOUT PASSING ENERGY BILL

By scheduling a 30-day recess, instead of staying in session to work on much needed legislation to cope with the energy crisis, Congress has made a horrible mistake.

This nation urgently needs legislative leadership to deal with immediate and long-range effects of the shortage of natural gas, gasoline, heating oil and other fuels.

For Congress to react to such an obvious priority by taking a month off for the holidays without enacting legislation is shockingly short-sighted . . . particularly with the peak winter heating season just starting and shortages threatened throughout the country.

I am not suggesting that we should have passed any of the three versions of the so-called Energy Emergency Act which were considered, and defeated, by the House on the last night of the session. This "Act" was an indecisive, vague, buck-passing bill that had more shortcomings than good features. It deserved to be rejected.

But when that happened, House-Senate leadership should have moved to delete the controversial sections of the bill (particularly rationing and taxation sections) so other portions of the bill could be approved without delay.

Allowing utilities now using oil and natural gas to switch back to coal and suspending emission standards when absolutely necessary on a temporary basis makes sense to me as did other similar provisions of the bill. These measures could have rapidly eased the energy shortage without undue hardship and without permanently lowering environmental standards.

As Congress continues to postpone action, and the energy shortage worsens, there is real danger the country will be stampeded into panicky solutions at a later time. If that happens, environmental progress of recent years could be seriously jeopardized.

And gasoline rationing may become inevitable.

I dread the prospect. Although some people think it sounds pretty good in theory, rationing is really only a way to allocate the hardship; it does nothing to reduce demand or increase supply; a huge (and costly!) bureaucracy will be required to administer rationing programs; rationing will cause economic dislocations, loss of jobs and black markets; rationing is inherently unfair.

As far as I am concerned, rationing is the last resort. Other solutions to the energy shortage are far more satisfactory.

THE KIND OF ENERGY LEGISLATION WE NEED

In addition to the temporary measures mentioned above, I will continue to press for permanent solutions based on increasing energy production, curtailing demand, encouraging energy conservation and protecting the environment. Specifically I recommend:

- (1) a new National Energy Policy; (2) accelerated development of off-shore oil; (3) increased production of natural gas; (4) tax incentives for energy production and conservation; (5) research for new energy sources and environmental protection; (6) deep water ports; (7) conservation of electric energy and peak demand reduction; (8) leadership for voluntary efforts; (9) free market pricing; (10) reorganization of Congress to gear up for energy legislation. (Believe it or not, at least 94 different committees and

subcommittees have jurisdiction over energy matters. Is it any wonder there's so much delay and confusion?) I'll be happy to send you details of my energy legislation and recommendations. Please drop me a note if you'd like me to do so.

ANNUAL CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES

(1950-71 Actual); (1972-85 Projected)

[The numbers indicate percentage of each use]

	Residential	Automobiles	Public transportation	Commercial	Industry	Energy conversion—loss—production of electricity
1950	13.0	10.2	16.0	11.6	39.0	10.2
1955	12.9	12.0	13.4	11.5	38.7	11.5
1960	13.8	12.9	11.9	12.3	36.4	12.7
1965	13.8	13.4	10.7	12.3	36.5	14.2
1970	13.4	13.9	10.5	11.9	33.7	16.6
1975	12.6	13.8	10.0	12.5	32.2	18.9
1980	12.4	14.1	9.8	12.4	30.7	20.6
1985	11.9	13.8	9.6	11.9	30.1	22.7

Reproduced through courtesy of Citizens Committee on Environmental Quality.

POLL RESULTS

Over 17,000 ballots have been returned in the Fifth Congressional District public opinion survey which I circulated last month. Since 50-60% of these represent the opinions of two persons, it looks like over 25,000 have taken part in this massive sampling.

As you can imagine, tabulating the returns is a huge job. Volunteers in Aurora and Colorado Springs have already counted about one-third of the total and hope to be finished within two weeks. As promised, we will send the final results to all who have requested a copy.

But from returns already processed, several main themes have emerged: An overwhelming majority think wage-price controls are falling; by almost 15 to 1 respondents say federal spending should be cut to control inflation and avoid higher taxes; direct election of the President is favored by 7 to 1; and by a slim margin (a ratio of 8 to 7) respondents say they are not fully satisfied with progress being made in cleaning up the environment.

I am gratified so many residents of the District took part in this survey. I plan to conduct a similar poll again in 1974.

JANUARY-FEBRUARY PLANS

Unless we are summoned back into session to act on energy legislation, Congress will be in recess until January 21st. So I will spend most of the month at home, visiting with friends in Aurora and Colorado Springs.

In February I plan to host some "town hall" style meetings in Burlington, Castle Rock and some other communities. Please let me know if you have any thoughts about how, when and where meetings of this type should be held.

FOR 1974 AND BEYOND

1973 has been a turbulent and troubled year for our country. I would certainly be the last to minimize problems or to discount the tough decisions and sacrifices ahead. It would be wrong to do so.

But it's also tragically wrong to over-emphasize our national shortcomings. Recently we've been so preoccupied with what's wrong with America that we're forgetting all the things that are right.

America is still the greatest nation in the world . . . in economic, industrial and military power . . . and more important, in moral purpose, character, self-discipline, intellect and optimism . . . and in freedom and institutions of self-government.

We have a great heritage to be thankful for. We can look forward to the future with pride and confidence.

Happy New Year!

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG.

## THE TECHNOLOGY OF PEACE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess I had the opportunity to read an article entitled "The Technology of Peace" by Morgan Harris, which appeared in the Friends "Quaker" Journal for October 15, 1973. The message of this article is that peace can be achieved only if we work for it as diligently as we work to achieve victory in war—in the words of the article:

The technology of keeping peace is just as intricate and highly developed as the technology of making war.

The essential element of the "technology" of peace is to be found in the structure of a federal union of states, the pattern pioneered so successfully by our own United States. Mr. Harris suggests that such a union could grow from the Atlantic Union proposal which is currently before the Congress.

Believing that many other Members of the Congress would be as interested in this very excellent article as I was, I am submitting it for printing in the Extension of Remarks section of the RECORD. The article follows:

### THE TECHNOLOGY OF PEACE

(By Morgan Harris)

While waiting at a bus stop near the corner of a park, a man noticed another man searching in the grass nearby. "Did you lose something?" he inquired.

"I dropped a ring."

"I'll help you look for it 'till my bus comes." And after a few moments, "Do you know where you dropped it?"

"Over there."

"Then why are you looking for it here?"

"The light's better here."

Searching for peace within the present nation-state system is looking where the light is better.

The light seems to show that evil men, hidden away in government somewhere, make war. But if one looks at the men who work in the Pentagon and those who made the decisions to carry on the bombing in Vietnam, one finds that they live in the state of Virginia and would not dream of bombing their neighbors in the state of Maryland. The difference in their acts arises out of the difference in the relationship of Virginia and Maryland in contrast to the relationship of the U.S. and Vietnam: it does not arise out of their character.

The cause of the sufferings endured in the Vietnams of the world is not that bad men make war, but that good men don't understand peace.

The light seems to show that war can be ended by tearing down the war system through confrontations, petitions, withholding income tax payments, peace demonstrations, writing congressmen, mass meetings, burning draft cards—war resistance. But if one looks at the history of war/peace,

one finds there has been resistance to nearly every war, but to the warmakers it has been like a mosquito—an irritating nuisance which does not stop them from doing their job.

These answers are too easy. Peace does not come that way.

The light seems to show that when a war is ended, we then have peace. This fallacy is deeply embedded in our culture. The American Heritage Dictionary, for instance, defines peace as "the absence of war." This is about as helpful as defining light as "the absence of darkness", or defining knowledge as "the absence of ignorance."

Peace is not merely the absence of war; peace is a continuing process of settling peaceably those disputes which otherwise would develop into conflicts, strife, violence, fighting and death. Peace is settling disputes by ballots instead of bullets.

It is a complex process, one that requires constitutions, courts, campaigns and the complicated apparatus to make it all work. In fact, the technology of keeping peace is just as intricate and highly developed as the technology of making war, but most people don't recognize it.

By applying this technology people have eliminated war from progressively larger areas of the earth down through the centuries. One of the earliest legends we have—the story of Cain and Abel—portrays a time in human history when, if a man felt he had been wronged by his brother, the only way he could be avenged would be to make a club and beat his brother's head in. No one knows how many centuries it was before this unsatisfactory method of achieving justice was replaced by individuals joining together in a tribe and selecting a chief to whom disputes were referred for settlement.

After that, members of the tribe did not kill each other, but tribes still fought. By the time the Europeans landed in America, however, some of the tribes on this continent were banded together in federations, and there was no longer war among those tribes.

As tribes settled down into cities, there were long ages during which cities fought each other. Babylon, Jericho, Troy—the legends of cities at war are still with us, but the practice is so long abandoned as to be forgotten. Peace among cities is so solidly embedded in our culture that anyone who seriously proposed that Chicago go to war with Toledo, or San Diego with Phoenix, would be looked on as a lunatic.

There is no mystery about how war has been eliminated—among individuals, among tribes, among cities, among states, provinces and nations. War has been eliminated by joining together to form a larger government. England and Wales fought for centuries. Three hundred years ago they joined together, by common agreement, to form Great Britain, and they have not had a war since. The cantons of Switzerland fought five wars in 300 years—wars in which every canton participated at one time or another. In 1847-48 they formed a federation, and they have not fought again—nor do they expect to.

The historical development is clear. The world now has areas in which millions of human beings live at peace with each other. Our own nation has fifty proud, independent, sovereign states organized into a federal union in which 200 million people live with absolutely no fear that their states are going to make war on each other.

The lesson is plain: war can be eliminated. We can have peace in any area—any size area—even the whole world. A federal union can be created by the citizens of any nations who want to get together, and it will result in peace among those citizens—those nations.

### ONE WAR IN 200 YEARS

"But", the skeptic may say, "What about the Civil War? Our federal union failed to assure peace there. Therefore, it is not true to say that federations can guarantee peace."

This is a fair challenge; we need to face it. There are a number of federal unions in the world: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Switzerland, the United States and others. Among all the nation-states in all of them put together there has been only one war in 200 years—a record that compares favorably with the hundreds of wars that have been fought during these two centuries among the states and nations outside of federal unions.

But there is more to the answer than that. We have to recognize that a federation, to succeed, must have the undergirding of common values. In his outstanding book, *The City of Man*, W. Warren Wagar summarizes the findings on this subject of Karl W. Deutsch and six historians, citing, "First, the peoples amalgamating must share major ethical goals and values relevant to policy-making; this does not necessarily mean identical religions or common values in all respects, but simply harmony in all areas where common policies must be hammered out."

To have a successful world federation, mankind must also have world community-common unity. This means shared human values and cultural values. It means respect for and maintenance of civil liberties.

### WHY FEDERATIONS SUCCEED

The founders of our nation understood that a federation requires enough democracy that the citizens of each member state (or nation) elect their own rulers and representatives. In Article IV, Section 4, of the Constitution, they wrote: The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government . . .

Although they do not explain the reason for this, it is important that we understand it as we work for a federation to guarantee peace, establish justice, promote general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to mankind. The reason is this: The strength of a federation arises from the fact that it derives its authority from individuals—its own citizens, who are also citizens of its member groups (states or nations).

When a member of the United States Congress acts in a way that is offensive to the governor of his state, that governor cannot recall him. The congressman is accountable only to his own constituents.

The result is that the congressman from any state—say Ohio—do not think and vote as a bloc, representing the interests of Ohio against those of other states. They vote as individuals. The Democratic congressmen from Ohio will unite with Democratic congressmen from Florida and Oregon, in opposition to Republican congressmen from Ohio, Florida and Oregon. The ties in such a situation are across state lines.

### AND LEAGUES FAIL

In an organization where the people do not elect the delegates—such as the United Nations—the delegates do not represent the people, they represent the nation and the government which appointed them, and which will recall them if they displease the government. Thus the United Nations is a league, a nation-vs.-nation organization, and the lines of the division within it are the same as those that divide the nations in the world outside.

There have been many leagues down through the ages, and enough federal unions during the past 200 years that we can study them historically. We find that no league has ever succeeded. By contrast, the success of federal unions establishes this form as the most practical way to organize nations for their mutual benefit.

### BY SEPARATING THE INNOCENT FROM THE GUILTY

To be united—to be cohesive—a federal union must derive its authority from the people, its own citizens, and not be dependent on the states or nations comprising it. It is equally true that, to maintain peace, it must exert its power only on individuals.

For instance, when President Nixon established economic controls in August, 1972, the governor of Texas announced publicly that Texas would not go along. What would have happened if the President had ordered the Pentagon to attack Texas? All the Texans would have been driven in self-defense to fight back, to fight alongside and in support of their governor (even those who may not have wanted to support him.) Innocent people would have been wounded and killed. It would have been the maximum of stupidity.

What did President Nixon do? Instead of turning to the Pentagon, he turned to the Attorney General of the United States who informed the governor of Texas that if he refused to obey the federal government he would be taken into court and tried.

This is how peace is maintained—by dealing with individuals—in courts of law where the innocent are separated from the guilty, and only the guilty punished.

The currently popular term, "world law" is ambiguous on this point. Do the people using it mean law bearing on individuals, or are they deceiving themselves that they can enforce law on groups—on states or nations? When they use the term "enforceable world law" it sometimes appears they are thinking of coercing nations. But just as in the case of Texas, efforts to enforce any law bearing on nations will lead directly to war. Any misunderstanding about this will be fatal—not to us, perhaps, but to all the young men and others who will die in unnecessary wars if we don't get our thinking on straight.

The founders of our nation dealt with the proposal to coerce a state by arms, analyzed it and discussed it thoroughly, and rejected it unanimously—because it will not work.

THE MADDEST PROJECT EVER DEvised

James Madison wrote: "A voluntary observance of the federal law by all the members could never be hoped for. A compulsive one . . . Involved equal calamities to the innocent and the guilty, the necessity of a military force both obnoxious and dangerous, and in general a scene resembling more a civil war than the administration of a regular government.

"Hence was embraced the alternative of a government which, instead of operating on the States, should operate without their intervention on the individuals comprising them."

Alexander Hamilton said: "It has been observed, to coerce States is one of the maddest projects ever devised. . . The thing is a dream, it is impossible."

Oliver Ellsworth said: "This Constitution does not attempt to coerce sovereign bodies. . . No coercion is applicable to such bodies but that of armed force. If we should attempt to execute the laws of the Union by sending an armed force against a delinquent State, it would involve the good and bad, the innocent and guilty, in the same calamity.

"But this legal coercion singles out the guilty individual, and punishes him for breaking the laws of the Union. All men will see the reasonableness of this; they will acquiesce, and say, 'Let the guilty suffer'."

Let us hope the advocates of "enforceable world law" will study the deliberations of the founders of our nation, and get their thinking straight about this bedrock principle lest they lead others astray into this "maddest" of projects.

As evidence that they are thinking straight, and to show clearly that they mean law bearing on individuals, they might well stop using the ambiguous term "enforceable world law" and substitute the term "individual world law."

WE CAN MAKE A START

To make the United Nations into an institution capable of maintaining peace in the world, it would have to be changed so it lived up to its name. Its member nations would have to be united—it would have to

become a union, a federal union. This would mean (1) its delegates would be elected by and represent the people, and (2) its laws would apply to individuals. Then the opening words of its charter, "We the people . . ." would be true and honest words.

Yet present world conditions are such that it is probably unrealistic to expect this. The world community—the common values needed to support a world federation—does not exist.

What then? We need to work at developing world brotherhood, of course. But must we wait until there is enough community to sustain a world federation before we can start it? Fortunately not. We need only enough shared values to be willing to make a start together. Once it is created, the existence of the federation will do more than anything else to develop the sense of community needed to keep it going—to make it succeed. Nothing will promote sharing and acceptance of each other and the development of a sense of brotherhood so much as living together in a federal union.

PEACE BASED ON JUSTICE REQUIRES COMMON VALUES

I think this is the important point about the Civil War. At the time the federal union was formed there was not enough common acceptance of the value of every person; the belief that no human being should be a slave. The process of living together in a federation was not sufficient to surmount this difference in cultural and human values. The difference was so great that after seventy years it flared into a war. Now that over a century more has passed, the common values shared by our people are sufficient that no one I ever heard of even dreams of the possibility of any of these states ever fighting the others again.

The difference in values among communist nations, outright dictatorships and democracies may be equally great in the world today. If so, it would not be possible to form a successful federal union for the entire world.

A MODEST SUCCESS IS BETTER THAN A MAMMOTH FAILURE

In this situation, some feel that world government is a grandiose impossibility at this time. They ask, why insist on all or nothing? Let's make a modest start with what we have—create a model federal union which can grow into a world organization gradually as one nation after another joins, just as our own federal union grew from its original thirteen to its present fifty. These practical thinkers propose to form a federation of those nations whose people share such values as democratic process, maintenance of civil liberties, and individual freedom.

Their proposal is incorporated in the Atlantic Union Resolution in Congress which authorizes representatives from these nations to meet and discuss how far they can advantageously apply the principles of federal union. If and when this program results in a proposed constitution for us to ratify, the people of the United States and other western nations will have the opportunity to decide whether they are ready to continue the historical process of enlarging the area of peace within a federal union larger than we have previously known. It will be open to others, and by a natural process of growth, in time it will become the universal brotherhood of which men have dreamed.

In the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the leading nations of the world renounced ". . . recourse to war for the solution of international controversies. . ." This function—that war performs, however miserably—is a necessary function. If war is to be eliminated, it must be replaced with some other procedure "for the solution of international controversies."

A reliable system of settling disputes peacefully is a prerequisite to the elimination of war. To have peace, humankind must replace the entire war system with a peace system.

A federation is such a reliable system—perhaps the only practical one available to us. How can we get it? We have already noted one way: start with those who already share sufficient common values.

At the same time we need to build up common values—develop understanding and sharing with the rest of the world. The widespread concern with such matters as ecology and the environment, overpopulation, poverty, hunger, food supplies and peace demonstrate that the concerns people throughout the world have in common are far more important than the petty differences that divide them.

Also, we need to study the organization of peace. We need to know everything worth knowing about how to organize the world (or any part of the world) for peace. This probably means improving our knowledge of U.S. history by reading *The Federalist Papers*, which are 200 years old but just as up-to-date as the Bible. There are other books—not as old, but setting forth principles that do not change with the years—that anyone who wants to be effective in working for a practical peace system should be familiar with.

Clarence Strett's *Union Now* is the book that gave me my first insight into the possibilities of peace in this war ridden world. Emery Reeves' *Anatomy of Peace* is "the pure milk of the word." Mortimer Adler said it simply and conclusively in *How to Think About War and Peace*. E. B. White assembled a delightful collection of his essays from the Talk of the Town section of the *New Yorker*, under the title: *Wild Flag*. Finally, Amitof Etzioni, *The Hard Way to Peace*, 1962; F. W. Schuman, *The Commonwealth of Man*, 1952; W. Warren Wagar, *The City of Man*, 1963, and *Building the City of Man*, 1971. Superb Books!

THE GREATEST ENEMY

Anyone who reads these books will know how peace can be achieved and maintained. He will know there is hope. He will realize that it is simply a matter of education—not confrontation, not sacrifice, not martyrdom, not war resistance, not tearing down the war machine, not condemning the "warmongers"—just simple understanding.

The reason we have war is that good persons do not understand peace. Because of this lack of understanding people who sincerely want to make a useful contribution to a peaceful world are distracted from effective action, and encouraged to participate in irrelevant, dead-end programs. Their time, energy and enthusiasm, which is so desperately needed in the task of building a peace system, is poured into the bottomless pit of war resistance and lost. Truly, "the second best is the greatest enemy of the best."

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Bill White, a kind and gracious man, wrote a tribute to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, which is truly and genuinely deserved.

Senator HUMPHREY is a man who loves his family, his country and its people, and our Democratic Party.

The text of the article from the *Houston Chronicle* of Tuesday, January 15, 1974, follows:

HUMPHREY IS EMBODIMENT OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By William S. White)

If a political party can be said to have a distinct personality—as it can—then some-

where within its ranks there is likely to be found one man who most truly embodies that personality on his own.

In this sense it is Sen. Hubert Horatio Humphrey who is Mr. Democrat. For his own human qualities are the predominant human qualities of his party collectively, to a degree not remotely matched by any other living Democrat.

Like his party, Humphrey is eternally optimistic, everlastingly outgoing, convivial and somewhat slaphappily disorganized and ready and eager to embrace the whole world. And he is subject to all the amiable frailties that all these traits imply.

Three times he has had a go at the presidency. And once—in 1968—he came so very close to it as to recall Wellington saying of Waterloo that it was a damn near-run thing.

If Hubert Humphrey had ever become the nation's innkeeper no one would ever have been turned away (although it is also true that the bookkeeper at the inn might have found it necessary to dip his pen into far more red ink than he would have cared to see).

The first time, in 1960, Humphrey never had much chance against John F. Kennedy for the Democratic nomination. The second time, Richard Nixon came in on top in the election by the narrowest of margins. The third try was, of course, in 1972, against George McGovern.

Ol' Hubert—a Senate cloakroom name that the Southerners first pinned on him in a kind of wry affection too strong to be swept aside by their disapproval of his liberalism—came a great deal closer than was generally recognized.

It was one of those "if" things. If a California poll that turned out to have been grossly inflated toward McGovern had not been so tremendously in error, Humphrey, and not McGovern, might well have carried the California primary.

If so, HHH likely would have been nominated at the Miami Beach convention. But that poll in California killed Humphrey. Contributors fled; campaign workers were thrown into disarray and defeatism long before primary election day. After all, McGovern looked to be a certain winner.

Characteristically, Humphrey bounced up from the floor after Miami Beach for the third time, grinning hugely on the outside and, as the old song went, inside dancing with tears in his eyes. A determined believer in the perfectibility of man—a bravely hopeful but most dubious credo shared by his party corporately—he stoutly campaigned for McGovern.

Inside the Senate, which he had first entered as almost a pariah back in the old days when his views on such as civil rights were almost universally regarded as dangerously far advanced, everybody welcomed back Ol' Hubert. Beyond the slightest doubt he would have won hands down over McGovern in any ballot among his Senate colleagues.

But 1972 put a period to Hubert Humphrey's presidential dreams. In that aspiration three strikes are out as surely as they are in any baseball game. So he simply went back to being the best senator he could, wise-cracking his way along but perfectly determined upon any project to which he set his hand.

Forgiving, as again is his party for the most part, he carried no grudge. In his mind he was everybody's friend and in consequence nearly everybody was and is his friend.

He has, for example, been notably generous to Richard Nixon in his time of troubles, even going to the point of saying publicly: "Look here, I'm no saint, myself."

So it is that during his current illness the "get well" messages that have poured in are genuinely and widely meant.

## SUPERCROOKS, OLD AND NEW

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while back in my district during the recess, I noticed an editorial appearing in the January 13, 1974, edition of the Peoria Journal Star, entitled "Supercrooks, Old and New."

The editorial contrasts the handling of the Watergate affair and the reaction to that incident with events taking place in earlier administrations and points out the different methods of handling them as well as the difference in reaction.

I think the message of the editorial will be of interest to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SUPERCROOKS, OLD AND NEW

When big news breaks we usually react directly.

It helps to examine other cases and see what really is normal as a guide to what a reasonable reaction is.

After a solid year of the "Watergate burglary" it came as something of a shock to me to re-read the details of the famous Brinks robbery, the largest in U.S. history, which took place not that long ago in Boston.

The team of thieves, 11 in all, prowled the Brinks headquarters for six months, night after night, studying every detail of the place, going through the records and the mail in the executive offices, and on four successive Saturday nights removing door-knobs with inset locks, taking them to a locksmith to have keys made, and then returning them to the doors! All this part of the preparation and planning for the eventual robbery.

When their perusal of records revealed the security company involved was the Brinks alarm system and related systems, they proceeded on more than one occasion to enter at night the headquarters and peruse their records in detail.

They checked one record at a time, carefully replacing it just as it had been.

Finally, all 11 of them entered the Brinks building (moving freely with their keys to all the doors) and held a rehearsal for the robbery itself in the dark of night!

They were very fussy about all kinds of seemingly remote risks, yet had no hesitation about these endless entries into two of the most sensitive and specialized security headquarters in the land!

This "normal" calculation among burglary specialists of long experience and spectacular success makes us realize that among the amazing assortment of incredible abnormalities of the whole Watergate affair, the original burglary attempt was very odd in its miserable failure resulting in the capture of the crew.

In the same book where I read of the Brinks crime, a second curiosity appears in the light of current events.

When Billy Sol Estes' \$22,000,000-dollar swindle began to unravel as a result of a legal action in Texas, he was, of course, identified as a big Democratic campaign giver and a close associate of a number of officials.

President John F. Kennedy called in his attorney general, brother Bobby, and advised him that if anything went sour it would be far better if the administration stepped in first to clean up the mess.

Attorney General Kennedy went to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, former

governor of Minnesota, and told him that if anybody in the administration was involved, they had better find it out quick and beat their own investigators to the punch.

Freeman made inquiries of his top deputies—who were directly involved—and returned to assure John F. and Robert Kennedy that they were "clean."

So, the White House and the Attorney General gave the matter no further attention.

Incredible? Not when we see what happened in the Watergate case, where the President also says he sat on his hands for months because he was assured by his attorney general and special assistant, as well, that they were "clean."

And not when we remember that confronted with charges that his high state department deputy, Alger Hiss, was actually a Russian spy, Harry S. Truman, responded that the charge was obviously a political "red herring" and conducted no "in-house" investigation.

What is remarkable is that in neither of those cases did anyone charge that higher-ups had to know or that their inaction was proof of complicity or incompetence. Nobody demanded that the President, personally, "tell the whole story" and "clear it up."

There was no drive to force testimony by promises of immunity to Mr. Hiss or Mr. Estes, or the official involved, in exchange for their charges against the White House.

There was no massive attack on executive privilege, no search of internal documents, and no abandonment of lawyer-client privilege, and, finally, no demand that the White House turn over its records and appear before Senate committees and otherwise prove its non-involvement.

History is amazing in its similarities in the reaction of top politicians to the threat of scandal—and equally amazing as to the differences in how that reaction is treated.

C. L. DANCEY.

(NOTE.—Details of these and other major criminal activities are in a new book by the Playboy Press called "The Super Crooks," Edited by Roger M. Williams.)

## 1974: A YEAR OF ACTION AND DECISION

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Seigenthaler, publisher of the Tennesseean in Nashville, Tenn., in a most perceptive article traces and analyzes the crucial events of 1973 and projects his perspective for 1974.

This is an excellent summary of some of the important highlights of 1973 and explains some of the anticipated events and proceedings of the new year as Congress reconvenes.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in these current issues and important matters, I place the article by Mr. Seigenthaler in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

THE YEAR 1974 LIKELY TO SEE LAST ACT IN NIXON'S PRESIDENTIAL TRAGEDY

(By John Seigenthaler)

It's been a long time for the nation from that mid-May morning when Sam Ervin's

oversized gavel crashed open the Senate Watergate hearings to this late-December day when everybody discusses presidential impeachment.

For a country shaken time and again by a government scandal known superficially as "Watergate" it has been a long, long time indeed.

And for Richard Milhous Nixon, 37th President, it has been the longest seven months of his life.

The President has been hurt personally and politically by the scandal; even by his efforts to respond to charges against his administration.

At year's end he had launched Operation Candor—a campaign to help his badly mangled public image. But even the answers the President offered raised fresh questions about his credibility.

"I'm not a crook," he blurted out on Nov. 17 when he met with newspaper managing editors at their Disney World convention in Florida.

It was a sad thing for a President to have to say. It was a denial he obviously felt he had to make.

These seven months have aged the President. Always youngish in appearance, suddenly he looks the 61 years old he will be in just ten days. At times in recent weeks he has seemed haggard, harried, harassed.

"He looks much older," commented a Tennessee newsman who saw Nixon in Memphis last month and who had covered the presidential campaign just a year before.

It was in Memphis that the President promised Republican governors there would be no more major "bombshells" in the Watergate Scandal.

Within 48 hours another bombshell hit: an inexplicable 18-minute "gap" existed in one of the controversial tape recordings he had turned over to Federal Judge John J. Sirica.

But, said the White House, that was no "bombshell"—it was merely a gap in a tape.

It was a bombshell to Gov. Winfield Dunn, who had hosted the presidential appearance before the GOP governors and who has supported the president consistently. Nixon, it turned out, had known about the tape gap when he had spoken in Memphis.

"I disagree that this is not a very important revelation," said Governor Dunn, clearly disappointed.

Other old associates of the President were expressing disappointment in him.

Dr. Billy Graham, the long-time Nixon intimate who has conducted White House prayer services, criticized the President in an interview with the evangelical magazine "Christianity Today."

"Some of his judgments have been wrong and I just don't agree with them," Graham said.

He later told AP Reporter George Cornell that he had personally found that "when you have made a mistake it's far better to admit it."

The President had isolated himself, Graham said, as Watergate had become "a symbol of political corruption and evil."

He expressed "surprise" that the President had given only \$295 to charity out of his gross income of \$280,000 in 1972. And he felt that a bad example had been set by allowing the federal government to pay for various improvements on Nixon's real estate.

"It seems to me that some of these expenses ought to have been personal," the minister said. He said some nice things about the President in his "Christianity Today" interview. He still had confidence in the President's integrity. But he had expressed his confidence in Nixon before. He told Cornell that he knew his negative comments about his old friend would make news and, as usual, Billy Graham was right.

The beleaguered President was stung by other criticisms from other supporters.

James J. Kilpatrick, the conservative syndicated columnist, urged impeachment action.

"The time has come, much as a longtime admirer regrets to say it, to proceed with the impeachment and trial of Richard Nixon," wrote, Kilpatrick. "Nothing else will clear the poisonous air."

Colorado Republican Senator Peter Dominick, a constant Nixon man, said: "No more deals and no more technical arguments about evidence. Nothing short of complete disclosure will restore the confidence of the American people."

Another intimate chum of the President, Sen. Barry Goldwater, whose daily conversation is an "operation candor" had his own uniquely unconventional idea about how to let the public have the "truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

Goldwater suggested that the President pay a surprise visit one morning on the Senate Watergate committee. "I think the only way he has out now would be to show up some morning at the Ervin Committee and say, 'Here I am, Sam. What do you want to know?'"

Newspapers across the nation which traditionally had supported the President—Nixon received editorial endorsements from 84% of the country's newspapers in 1972—now were digging him. The President found himself critically satirized by some of the best-known editorial cartoonists—the majority of whom had always been friendly to him.

Once an administration official makes news as being involved in Watergate his most personal actions become newsworthy.

An example: Charles Colson, the former Nixon aide who during the 1972 campaign was correctly quoted as saying of the President: "I would walk over my grandmother to get that man elected."

Colson, the author of the so-called "enemy lists" is under a grand jury investigation himself. He is remembered as the witness who never appeared before the Watergate committee. At one point, before the committee ended its first phase of hearings, Colson was demanding to appear. When the committee delayed his appearance and he became the subject of a grand jury inquiry, Colson sent word to the Ervin committee that if called he would take the Fifth Amendment.

Two weeks ago Colson was back in the news. At a White House prayer ceremony he announced that he had "found Christ." His testimonial was a firm, public declaration of religious faith. He had been praying a good deal since leaving the White House, said the adviser who helped arrange Jimmy Hoffa's release from federal prison.

He knew there would be skeptics in the press who would scoff at his sudden "conversion."

"I'll pray for them," he said.

There is no doubt, as 1974 ends, that the people and the politicians are tired of hearing and reading and thinking about Watergate.

But the scandal cannot evaporate now.

The year 1973 was the Senate hearings phase of the investigation.

The year 1974 will be the year of House impeachment action.

The clamor and noise of the Senate hearings had faded when, on November 15 Senator Ervin's gavel fell on the final session of the year.

The committee had just heard a parade of witnesses from big business come in and confess that their companies had given illegally hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Nixon campaign—under pressure.

While the sworn admissions of white collar crime were shocking, the public was worn out on Watergate and the revelations made little impact. Companies are not allowed,

under federal law, to make direct contributions to federal election campaigns.

It must have been a humiliating experience for the several giants of the business world to come forward and confess that they had authorized illegal political payments.

Orin Atkins, chairman of the board of Ashland Oil, Inc., admitted his company made an illegal donation of \$100,000 to the Nixon campaign, Atkins said the contact with his company came from Maurice Stans, former Commerce Secretary who headed up the fund raising effort to put \$60 million behind the Nixon reelection race.

"I felt more or less obligated," Atkins said. "We wanted to assure ourselves a forum—a calling card to get us in the door to make our point of view heard in the executive branch."

It was a \$100,000 calling card!

Claude C. Wild, chief Washington lobbyist for Gulf Oil, said he was contacted by both Stans and former attorney general John Mitchell.

"I certainly considered it pressure when two cabinet officers asked me for funds," said Wild. "It's different than someone collecting for the Boy Scouts . . . I thought I got a message."

And the President's campaign got another \$100,000.

George Spater, former board chairman of American Airlines, said he felt pressure when he was contacted by Herbert Kalmbach, the personal attorney for Nixon. Kalmbach, incidentally is also the lawyer for United Air Lines.

"Since he was the President's personal counsel and also counsel to American's largest competitor I decided an affirmative response was necessary," said Spater.

American Airlines contributed \$75,000.

Since the giving was against the law the corporations had devised complicated schemes to hide the donations.

In American Airlines' case the funds were covered by counterfeit invoices routed through Lebanon. Ashland Oil used a subsidiary in far-off Gabon to screen the gift. In both instances the money was "laundered" through Swiss banks before it went into the Nixon campaign.

Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co., which along with Braniff Airways kicked in \$40,000 each, went so far at one point as to give the Senate Committee a list of phony names of donors. When confronted by the facts of the corporate gift, however, Goodyear admitted the truth.

The most devious plot to give money was propounded by officials of American Ship Building Co., which gave eight of its executives bonuses to cover up a \$100,000 corporate payment to the Nixon campaign. When a federal grand jury, at the urging of then Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox started nosing around in the area of corporate giving two of American Ship Building's "bonus boys" were subpoenaed. Matthew Clark, director of purchasing for the company, and Robert Bartlome, corporate secretary, testified before the Senate committee that they were urged by George M. Steinbrenner III, chairman of the board of the ship building firm, to lie to the FBI about their "bonuses." They did lie to the FBI, they said. But when they were called before a grand jury they decided to tell the truth.

"All I could see was me standing behind bars," said Clark. His boss, Steinbrenner, was upset, said Bartlome. According to the company secretary, the board chairman "laid his head on his desk . . . and mentioned something about jumping off a bridge." Steinbrenner told the Senators that if called before the committee he would plead the Fifth Amendment.

And so, on November 27, Senator Ervin and his vice chairman, Sen. Howard Baker

of Tennessee, jointly announced that the committee would take an indefinite recess.

There had been 265 hours of testimony from 61 witnesses during the 53 days of hearings by the committee. An estimated 25 million daily televiewers had watched the hearings during the height of the early sessions. A total of 30,000 spectators had crammed the Senate caucus room from May until November to watch the senators work on the witnesses.

The record of the hearings covered more than 10,000 pages—more than 2 million words. The whole affair had cost the taxpayers \$1 million and the committee was asking for another \$500,000 to finish up its work next year.

On the other side of the struggle, White House legal fees for providing a defense of the President have been estimated, to date, to have cost the taxpayers about \$500,000—according to U.S. News & World Report.

Already the Watergate Committee—with the authorization of the full Senate—has moved to try to get a long list of tape recordings from the White House. This effort will, no doubt, result in another court battle. And the Senate Committee may have further hearings next year as it looks into such matters as a \$100,000 donation made to the campaign of the President by the reclusive multimillionaire Howard Hughes—which money was given to presidential pal, C. G. (Bebe) Rebozo. According to Rebozo, a Florida banker, he kept the \$100,000 in a safe deposit box for three years, then gave it back to a Hughes representative.

When the Senate Committee held a closed session with the public excluded last month a Hughes agent, Chester Davis, suddenly opened a briefcase and dumped stacks of \$100 bills on to a table in front of the goggle-eyed senators.

"Here is the god damned money," said Davis.

"Do with it what you will."

Senator Ervin had the money's serial numbers taken and gave it back to Davis after the committee staff counted it. For some unexplained reason it totaled \$100 more than \$100,000.

Sam Ervin himself had an announcement as his committee quit work for the year; he will not run for re-election next year but will return instead to his beloved North Carolina hills in retirement.

The 77-year-old senator, a former judge in his native state, has been considered the senate's leading expert on the Constitution, the Bible, and Shakespeare (he quotes all three from memory and at will). His dancing eyebrows and pithy sayings captured the national imagination during the peak TV showings of the hearings. The nation may not miss his committee's hearings much next year. But Ervin will be missed.

From the time that the Watergate burglary became public knowledge the word that has described the mentality that created it was "stupid."

But the stupidity has not been all on one side.

Stupid—and unethical as well—were the actions of William Dobrovir, a lawyer for Ralph Nader, who brought a suit to acquire access to a White House tape. When the White House finally gave up the tape—a recording relating to charges that President Nixon acted favorably to the milk industry in return for a campaign contribution pledges from industry officials—Dobrovir made his own copy which he took home and played for guests at a cocktail party.

There was little on the tape of interest, apparently. But that did not excuse Dobrovir's conduct. He told his guests that he had "the hottest piece of news in town" in his jacket pocket. He played it for them while they munched chopped liver and salami and drank cocktails.

Called into court Dobrovir apologized to the judge and said: "I made a foolish mistake." And he was right.

Now the attention span of the public will shift from the Senate to the House. There a greying, veteran Democratic congressman from New Jersey, Rep. Peter J. Rodino, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, will take over the business of considering impeachment.

Rodino, is a quiet-spoken Italian-American whose re-election next year may be endangered because of a heavy influx of black voters who number approximately half of his constituency.

Last week Rodino employed John Doar, a Republican lawyer who worked under Robert Kennedy as a civil rights prosecutor in the Justice Department, to head up the staff of the committee to work on impeachment.

Doar, a native of Wisconsin who has lived in New York since leaving the Justice Department, is a careful legal tactician.

He became widely known in the South during the days lawsuits were brought to desegregate schools, lunch counters and public accommodations. He started in the Department of Justice in the Eisenhower administration and worked in the late 1950's on voter rights for blacks in Haywood and Fayette counties of Tennessee. Later, in the administration of President Johnson, he headed the civil rights division of the Justice Department.

Rodino, whose committee has been sharply divided along partisan party lines as it has considered impeachment issues, was seeking a Republican lawyer. Doar met that requirement. And Doar's pro-civil rights record won't do chairman Rodino any damage in his home district when the congressman faces re-election next year.

A personal note on Doar: In 1961 he and I traveled together to Southern cities on Justice Department business. Sometimes, in those days, it was necessary to move fast, from one city to another, living out of a suitcase. One day in Montgomery, Ala., I failed to move fast enough in the midst of a race riot and was knocked unconscious. I was wearing a shirt borrowed from John Doar. I still have it. Laundering failed to remove the blood stains.

What now will be the impeachment procedure?

Congressman Rodino's committee will conduct its own investigation of a variety of charges against the President. The committee will have to consider whether the President has committed "high crimes and misdemeanors"—which is the language of the U.S. Constitution as the document discusses impeachable offenses.

What is a "high crime"?

Professor Raoul Berger, of Harvard Law School, considered the nation's leading authority on the impeachment process, has concluded that the founding fathers, in writing the Constitution, saw a "high crime" as a crime against public or government policy.

According to Berger's theory, if a public official took some action which violated his trust as an officer of government that action, which would not have involved a criminal law violation, would have been a "higher" crime than an ordinary felony.

Berger has pointed out that the founding fathers, in preparing the impeachment provision in the Constitution, spoke specifically of "maladministration" by a public official as a "high crime."

On these pages a few weeks ago Professor Paul Sanders of the Vanderbilt Law school quoted James Madison as saying the "wanton removal" of a "meritorious" government worker would be maladministration and would liable a President to impeachment.

If this is to be considered by the House Judiciary Committee then the removal of

Archibald Cox might be considered an impeachable offense.

The last time an impeachment resolution was written in Congress it called for an investigation of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who had taken honorariums for speech-making and whose several marriages to younger women have upset some legislators.

At that time Gerald Ford, the new Vice President, declared as a member of the House of Representatives that an impeachable offense was "any damn thing the Congress wants to make it."

A number of Senators and Congressmen, however, have indicated they view "high crimes" as the actual commission of a felony—a breaking of a criminal statute.

However Rodino's committee views the question, if his body, after hearings, reports a bill of impeachment to the full House of Representatives, then it will include a list of "high crimes and misdemeanors." At this point the full House will be called upon to vote, item by item, on the charges in this list.

If a simple majority of the House votes for that bill then the President is impeached—which simply means "indicted"—and the bill of charges upon which he is impeached is then sent to the U. S. Senate. There a public trial would be held with Chief Justice Warren Burger presiding and all the 100 Senators acting as jurors. Vice President Gerald Ford, who normally presides over the Senate, would step aside.

The Senate would hear the arguments brought by the House and then listen to the defense offered by lawyers for the President. If two-thirds of the Senators—that would be 67 of the body of 100, if all members were present—voted to convict the President on any one charge, he would thereby be removed from office.

The only time in history an effort has been made to remove a President came in 1867 when the House impeached—or indicted—President Andrew Johnson, but the Senate failed by one vote to find him guilty. He remained in office.

The matters which the Rodino committee will surely consider will include:

Whether the President made a conscientious effort to find out whether any of his appointees in government, or in his campaign, violated the law regarding Watergate.

Whether he made a conscientious effort to discover whether any of his appointees in government covered up the crimes of Watergate.

Whether the President himself participated in the coverup.

Whether there was any negligence or intentional wrongdoing in the handling of the controversial tapes during the time they were under subpoena but in the custody of the White House.

Judge Sirica, himself, is yet to be heard on the question of what he thinks about the White House efforts to explain how some tapes are missing—or never existed—and how an 18-minute gap occurred in a tape which was transcribed by the President's veteran and faithful secretary, Rose Mary Woods.

Whether there is any wrongdoing in the President's directing the federal government to improve his vacation homes.

Whether there is any wrongdoing in the President's failure to pay certain taxes on the increase in property values of his homes as a result of federally financed improvements and as a result of his negotiations with friends such as Rebozo and industrialist Robert Abplanap to gain ownership of property.

Whether there was any wrongdoing in the President's using his vice presidential papers as a \$500,000 tax deduction which cut his income taxes to almost nothing in 1971 and 1972.

Obviously, the Rodino committee will labor long and struggle hard as it deals with these and other questions. It should be at least three months before any report should be expected from the committee to the full House.

As Rodino's committee moves steadily forward the Watergate Special Prosecutor, Leon Jaworski, and his staff, were pursuing further investigations aimed at bringing indictments against those who committed Watergate crimes.

Jaworski, picked by the President to succeed Archibald Cox, has kept on most of the Cox staff of lawyers and is allowing them to pursue their lines of inquiry without interference.

White House aides voiced some disgruntlement with Jaworski for keeping intact the Cox staff of investigators. But Jaworski, a Texas lawyer who was once president of the American Bar Association, was proceeding in a fashion that gave confidence to his young team of attorneys. He won from the new Nixon Attorney General, William B. Saxbe, the former Ohio Senator, a pledge of absolute independence. Saxbe's predecessor attorney general, Elliott Richardson, had given that same pledge to Cox before the President fired him. Jaworski pledged that additional indictments will be forthcoming and trials will go forward as rapidly as possible. He estimated two years of work ahead for his staff.

Congressman Rodino was charged with "foot dragging" in launching his probe into impeachment questions. There is not much doubt that he discussed his timing and pace with House Speaker Carl Albert, the Oklahoma Democrat who was in line to succeed Nixon while the vice presidency was vacant.

Albert and other Democratic leaders, including Rodino, did not want any action taken against the President as long as the Vice President's position was vacant. That would make it appear that the Democrats were interested in moving against the chief executive in order to have their party—and Albert—assume the White House.

And so, after Spiro Agnew resigned as Vice President and admitted not paying income taxes in violation of federal laws, the Democrats moved first on the business of putting Nixon's choice, former Congressman Gerald Ford, into the vice presidency before proceeding with impeachment issues.

Ford, a Michigan conservative, has always been a loyal GOP party member. He is considered steady, stable, reliable, hard working and plain spoken.

President Johnson once accused him of being "dumb"—but in appearing before committees of the Senate and House Ford showed himself to be an astute politician, an aware public official and a dedicated public servant.

He is well-liked in Congress. His choice was a popular one. Last week national poll taker Louis Harris found that in a trial-heat against leading Democratic presidential contenders Ford did extremely well.

Harris reported that his public opinion survey showed that if the election were tomorrow Vice President Ford could defeat either Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts or Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington.

Before he was appointed Ford said he would not run to succeed President Nixon. Political observers who know Ford as a man who rarely reverses himself on an issue, expect that he will have to change his mind on this one.

And so the President of the United States has endured his longest and most trying year. In almost every way 1973 was a tragic drama for Richard Nixon. He suffered.

The same pollsters who now say his Vice President would beat either leading Democrat in 1976 are the same opinion samplers who have found that 47% of the people believed that Nixon acted in the Watergate investigation as if he were "above the law" while

42% said he was acting within his rights. The same pollsters found that 56% of the people felt the President violated his promise to "get to the bottom" of Watergate, 50% thought he was involved in financial wrongdoing and 68% believed at the end of the year that the President knew about the Watergate coverup.

What will 1974 mean for the President? He is a tough and tenacious political fighter. As he himself has announced, he is not a man to quit or to turn and run. He knows he is the chief executive of a nation that is confronted by a major energy shortage and a dangerously tight economy.

He has strengths. His record in foreign affairs continues, under the direction of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, to bring him prestige. His relationships with major Communist powers continue to keep tensions down. His efforts to cool tempers in the Arab-Israeli world have, at least temporarily, succeeded. And he can be expected to allow his new, popular Vice President to move in on many domestic areas to help raise his standing on issues at home.

But the President's credibility is low—as Billy Graham and his other friends recognize. His ability to govern has been weakened—as many Republican congressional leaders have conceded. His administration has been ravaged by scandal. And in the coming year—as in the last—he will be the most investigated man in America. As 1973 closed the political survival of Richard Nixon is an open question.

RESOLUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, N.Y.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD the resolution of the United Nations Association of New York, N.Y., passed January 8, 1974. I commend the organization for its forthrightness in condemning Arab blackmail, terrorism, and hijacking.

UNA-NY BOARD ADOPTS RESOLUTION CONCERNING OIL WEAPON

The following resolution was adopted unanimously by the UNA-NY Board of Directors at a meeting held on January 8, 1974: Concerned by the openly announced purpose of certain Arab states to use "the oil weapon" as a means of attempting coercion of American foreign policy in the Middle East;

Recalling the 1970 Resolution of the General Assembly concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states, in which it was declared that "No state may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measure to coerce another state in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from its advantages of any kind";

Deeply disturbed by the continued use or support of terrorism, hijacking, and extralegal guerrilla forces, on the part of some Arab states;

The United Nations Association of New York, N.Y., through its board of directors, reaffirms its resolutions of October 9, 1973, and further resolves:

1. We condemn totally, as an unwarranted attempt to coerce the foreign policy of another country, the imposition of an oil boycott against the United States and other na-

tions, by the Arab States. We urge that the government of the United States, through our delegation at the United Nations and in all other appropriate ways, reaffirm our belief that oil blackmail is a threat to the peace and security of the world.

We must also recognize that this threat is particularly dangerous to the developing nations of the Third World.

2. We remind the American people that in a similar situation nearly two centuries ago, our ancestors responded through their Ambassador with the declaration, "We have millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." We warn our fellow citizens against propaganda efforts to set group against group in the present fuel shortage and urge them not to allow these actions regarding oil to in any way influence their judgment regarding other aspects of foreign policy.

3. We urge the committee of the Assembly now dealing with hijacking and terrorism to accelerate its work, and to promptly submit to the nations agreements which will outlaw such crimes, by making them punishable in every state, by requiring the extradition of guilty persons, and by such other means as may be appropriate.

GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE—50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, over the years it has been my pleasure, as a private citizen, a New Jersey State Senator, and a Member of Congress, to have had a close and intimate relationship with one of the outstanding institutions in my State, Glassboro State College. Most of you probably recognize the name as being the site of a famous summit meeting several years ago between the late President Lyndon B. Johnson and Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin. Although this brought worldwide attention to "our" college, its niche in history will be carved through its outstanding service to the students, faculty, citizens, and the State of New Jersey.

The college is now celebrating its first 50 years. On this occasion, it is my pleasure to introduce for the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Glassboro State College board of trustees in recognition of service to the State of New Jersey:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Legislature of the State of New Jersey and the citizens of Glassboro have had foresight and concern over the education of their youth and so established and supported for a half a century Glassboro State College which has been devoted primarily to the preparation of teachers; and

Whereas, to this laudable objective, the Administration and Faculty have successfully dedicated themselves for fifty years; and

Whereas, the Board of Higher Education of New Jersey has further broadened the original concept of the founders of Glassboro State College so that it now educates youth and adults in the liberal arts, the fine and performing arts and in administrative sciences; and

Whereas, there has been typically a close interrelationship of fifty years duration between faculty, administration, students and the community to pursue successfully the goals of the founders by improving our society; and

Whereas, the Students, Administration, and Faculty do hereby memorialize the founders, salute the citizens and rededicate themselves so that their wit and wisdom may further enhance the liberating arts and thereby press toward the goal of a well educated citizenry; Therefore be it

Resolved, that the successes of a half century of Glassboro State College's efforts be noted with appreciation to those who have gone before and are departed as well as to those who currently strive with humility and eagerness to further the accomplishments of Glassboro State College; and Further be it

Resolved, that this recognition of a half century of Glassboro State College's dedication and accomplishment be spread upon the minutes of the Board of Trustees, the Student Government, and Faculty Senate and that due notice of such accomplishment of the past and dedication to the present and future of Glassboro State College be forwarded to the Board of Higher Education, the Legislature, the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Congress of the United States of America.

## BENEFITS OF LEGAL ABORTION

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on this first anniversary of the Supreme Court's historic decisions legalizing abortion, I would like to share with my colleagues a very impressive statement made by 50 physicians. In brief, they find that fewer women are dying during pregnancy and childbirth and fewer infants are dying in the first year or the first month of life; there is a decline in hospital admissions for botched abortions, and the complication rate is falling as physicians gain greater experience and women seek abortion earlier in pregnancy; further, for the first time in New York City, out-of-wedlock births have declined.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the full text of the pamphlet released by the National Association for Repeal of Abortion Laws, entitled "Fifty Physicians Evaluate Legal Abortion in New York":

### THE PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS OF LEGAL ABORTION IN NEW YORK

(A statement by 50 physicians)

No measure of the health of nations and cities is more widely accepted than the health of mothers and newborn babies. As physicians practicing under New York State's 1970 abortion law, we have talked with and treated many women, and are convinced elective abortion has joined family planning and prenatal care as an effective public health weapon against maternal and infant mortality.

Elective abortion is now available to those women with the greatest risk of dying in childbirth or whose infants are most likely to die soon after birth. These women include the very young and the unmarried, unprepared for the responsibilities of motherhood; women who have had many previous births and pregnancies; women nearing the end of their fertile period; women with a history of viral infections, drug addiction, or hereditary factors which can damage the fetus; and women with medical handicaps that make a term pregnancy a serious risk.

While the law compels no one to have an abortion, these high-risk women have indeed made use of the medical service now available to them. The following data\* reflect the improving picture of infant and maternal mortality since the abortion law became effective on July 1, 1970.

#### FEWER WOMEN ARE DYING DURING PREGNANCY AND CHILDBIRTH

In 1971, the first full year in which elective abortion was available, New York City's maternal mortality rate dipped to an historic low:

1969—5.3 per 10,000.

1970—4.6 per 10,000.

1971—2.9 per 10,000.

Abortion alone does not account for the dramatic decline in maternal mortality; increased access to family planning is an important factor. However, the sharp drop in the first full year of the abortion program is probably not coincidental.

Maternal mortality rates have always included abortion-associated deaths, under criminal as well as legal circumstances. In 1964, when the overall maternal mortality rate was as high as 6.7, there were 2.8 abortion deaths for every 10,000 live births. In 1971, this figure was only 0.9, a two-thirds drop. Fewer women today are dying as a result of criminal abortions.

#### DECLINE IN HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS FOR "BOTCHED" ABORTIONS

The decline in criminal abortions and dangerous attempts at self-abortion is confirmed by experience in ten large New York City public hospitals which have collected continuous data on women requiring care after an incomplete abortion begun outside. These data show that incompetently performed abortions ("botched") and spontaneous abortions (miscarriages) averaged 480 per month in the first six months under the new law. They dropped sharply to only 199 per month a year later. Since the number of spontaneous abortions tends to remain fairly steady, the decline reflects a true drop-off in criminal or self-induced abortions.

#### FEWER INFANTS ARE DYING IN THE FIRST YEAR OF LIFE

In New York City, the infant mortality rate reached an historic low in 1971:

1969—24.4 per 1,000 live births.

1970—21.6 per 1,000 live births.

1971—20.7 per 1,000 live births.

Infant mortality (deaths during the first year) reflects environmental as well as congenital risk factors, including poor care often given the unwanted child. Access to abortions is by no means the principal cause of the decline, but there is no doubt that it has contributed.

#### FEWER INFANTS ARE DYING IN THE FIRST MONTH OF LIFE

Neonatal mortality (deaths that occur within the first 28 days of an infant's life) is a most significant indicator of the birth of high-risk infants, since most infant mortality occurs in this period. In 1971, the decline in neonatal mortality surpassed the drop in overall infant mortality:

1969—18.1 per 1,000 live births.

1970—16.2 per 1,000 live births.

1971—14.9 per 1,000 live births.

An important corollary was a 16.4 percent decline in the number of low-birth-weight infants between 1970 and 1971 (as compared to an 11.0 percent decline in the number of "normal"-weight babies). This is highly significant, since infants of low birth weight (under 2,500 grams, or about 5½ pounds) are at greatest peril during the first month of life and account for the greatest proportion of infant deaths.

\*All figures are from the New York City Department of Health. Over two-thirds of New York State abortions were performed in the City.

#### OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS HAVE DECLINED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN NEW YORK CITY

This drop of 12.1 percent was the first since 1954, when the Department of Health first began to collect data on these births: 1970—31,903. 1971—28,036.

Unwanted births present the greatest hardship to unmarried women, many of whom are very young and less likely to seek the prenatal and postnatal care so essential for the well-being of their infants. Indeed, a New York City Department of Health study in 1961 found that the infant mortality rate for illegitimate children was 48.2 per 1,000 live births, more than twice as high as that for infants born to married women in the same year. Thus it is extremely desirable to reduce out-of-wedlock births from a public health standpoint.

#### THE INCREASING SAFETY OF ABORTION

The complication rate in New York City has, from the start, compared favorably with rates in other countries where abortion is legal, and has steadily declined. The complication rate per 1,000 is as follows:

#### Overall, early abortions, and late abortions

July 1970—June 1971: 8.5, 4.6, and 26.8.

July 1971—May 1972: 6.9, 3.1, and 26.6.

This decline in the number of reported complications developed as physicians gained greater experience with abortion techniques and as women, educated to the availability of safe medical abortion, sought it early in pregnancy when the risk of complication is minimal. A study of 5,000 consecutive late abortions in one hospital reveals that the complication rate in late abortions can be reduced an additional 50 percent when performed by trained, experienced physicians, with 24-hour supervision by obstetrically-trained house physicians.

The trend toward early abortions is reflected in these data:

July—December 1970—71.7%.

July—December 1971—78.7%.

The rate of deaths associated with legal abortions performed in New York City during the period July 1970 through May 1971, including a generous estimate of out-of-town patients dying elsewhere, was 7 per 100,000 for all legal abortions and 1 per 100,000 for abortions in the first trimester. The overall rate was less than half the rate of deaths resulting from complications of pregnancy and childbirth, according to estimates made by Christopher Tietze, M.D., Associate Director of the Bio-Medical Division of The Population Council and the world's foremost authority on abortion statistics. The death rate from abortion during the first trimester was less than one-sixth that of deaths resulting from pregnancy and childbirth.

Not measurable in statistical terms is relief from the psychological, social, and economic distress of an unwanted pregnancy. Most gratifying to us in our private practices has been the beneficial results of legal abortion on patients who were unwilling, unable, or unready to become mothers.

As physicians with a profound concern for infant and maternal mortality, we believe that elective abortion has greatly relieved a major public health problem by increasing options available to prevent an unwanted birth or one that would constitute a risk to the health of mother or child. We view abortion as a back-up medical technique when contraception has failed or been absent. It is an option that women should have available to them.

The record of legal abortion in New York is an impressive endorsement of the soundness and humaneness of the 1970 abortion law.

This statement is endorsed by the following New York State obstetrician-gynecologists:

Karlis Adamsons, M.D., Ph. D., Professor of

Obstetrics & Gynecology, The Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, New York City.

John G. Allen, M.D., Planned Parenthood of Corning.

Hussein Amin, M.D., Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center, Bronx.

Stewart Bauman, M.D., Syracuse.

John Boyce, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Kings County Hospital, Brooklyn.

Judith T. Brook, M.D., Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Health Center, Bronx.

Wolf Catz, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Adelphi Hospital, Brooklyn.

Sheldon H. Cherry, M.D., Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, The Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, New York City.

C. Alan B. Clemetson, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Methodist Hospital of Brooklyn.

Elizabeth B. Connell, M.D., New York City.

Wilbur M. Dixon, M.D., Medical Director, Broome County Planned Parenthood.

Gerard E. Evans, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Caledonian Hospital, New York City.

Henry Freedman, M.D., Long Island College Hospital, Brooklyn.

Mary Anna Friederich, M.D., Associate Professor of Obstetrics-Gynecology & Psychiatry, University of Rochester School of Medicine & Dentistry.

Wilton G. Fritz, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Community Hospital of Brooklyn.

William H. Godsick, M.D., Forest Hills.

Edward J. Grandt, M.D., Medical Director, Planned Parenthood of Chemung-Corning, Inc.

John G. Hamilton, M.D., Rochester.

Richard Hausknecht, M.D., Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, The Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, New York City.

Norman Herzog, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Morrisania Hospital, Bronx.

Irwin H. Kaiser, M.D., Professor of Gynecology & Obstetrics, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx.

Thomas Kerenyi, M.D., Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, The Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, New York City.

George J. Kleiner, M.D., Associate Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx.

Schuyler G. Kohl, M.D., Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Downstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Brooklyn.

R. Paul Kradel, M.D., Rochester.

Hans Lehfeldt, M.D., Clinical Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, New York University School of Medicine, New York City.

Jack Lippes, M.D., Associate Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, State University of New York, Buffalo.

Nathan Mandelman, M.D., Assistant Attending Obstetrician-Gynecologist, The Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York City.

Malcolm Merrill, M.D., Attending Obstetrician-Gynecologist, F.F. Thompson Hospital, Ontario County.

James H. Nelson, Jr., M.D., Professor & Chairman, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Downstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Brooklyn.

Bernard Nathanson, M.D., Assistant Professor of Clinical Obstetrics & Gynecology, Cornell University Medical College, New York City.

Robert D. Patchell, M.D., Acting Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Harlem Hospital Center, New York City.

A. Jefferson Penfield, M.D., Medical Director, Planned Parenthood of Syracuse.

Robert S. Phillips, M.D., Syracuse.

William Pomerance, M.D., Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Downstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Brooklyn.

Anna T. Rand, M.D., Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx.

Martin B. Raskin, M.D., Chief of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Interboro General Hospital Brooklyn.

Seymour L. Romney, M.D., Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx.

Albert Rothman, M.D., Clinical Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology Upstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Syracuse.

Joseph J. Rovinsky, M.D., Chief Obstetrician, City Hospital Center at Elmhurst.

Jerome H. Rudolph, M.D., Associate Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, University of Rochester.

Azmain Qureshi Sadruddin, M.D., Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Health Center, Bronx.

Morton A. Schiffer, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Jewish Hospital and Medical Center, Brooklyn.

Harold Schulman, M.D., Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx.

David H. Sherman, M.D., Assistant Attending Obstetrician-Gynecologist, The Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York City.

Frederick Silverman, M.D., New York City.

King R. Snyder, M.D., Arnot Ogden Memorial Hospital, Elmira.

Samuel Soichet, M.D., New York Hospital, New York City.

Kenneth T. Steadman, M.D., Geneva.

Francis L. Stevens, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Unity Hospital, Brooklyn.

Donald P. Swartz, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Harlem Hospital Center, New York City.

Christopher Tietze, M.D., New York City.

Harold M. M. Tovell, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, St. Luke's Hospital Center, New York City.

Alois Vasicka, M.D., Chief of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Coney Island Hospital, Brooklyn.

William D. Walden, M.D., Clinical Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Cornell University Medical College, New York City.

Arthur Weinberg, M.D., Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Peninsula General Hospital, Far Rockaway.

#### JOSE BERNAL

### Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE YVONNE BRAITHWAITE BURKE, MEMBER, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Whereas, Jose Bernal of Lomita has demonstrated his great love of democracy by his activities as Vice-President of the Cuban Refugee Committee in Los Angeles, and;

Whereas, Jose Bernal, former minority leader of the Cuban Parliament, who left Cuba in 1960 has helped hundreds of Cubans living in Southern California through his work, and;

Whereas, Jose Bernal remains firmly dedicated to the principles of freedom and liberty, and to the return of these principles to Cuba,

Therefore, be it known this 29th day of December 1973 that we are in recognition of the outstanding nature of Mr. Bernal's work and his continued efforts on behalf of Cuban

refugees in this country, and it is further directed that this commendation be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

YVONNE BRAITHWAITE BURKE,  
Member of Congress,  
37th District, California.

#### THE ENERGY CRISIS

### HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis continues to dominate the news and is a matter of urgent concern for all Americans. The suddenness with which this problem came upon us has resulted already in passage of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 and further action on a more comprehensive energy act.

Along with a number of my colleagues, I have become gravely concerned about the paucity of reliable information on energy uses and energy resources. Almost daily the news media carry stories about conflicts in information about where the oil is and how much is really available. The January 8, 1974, edition of the Oil Daily had a headline, "Simon Seeks Better Oil Statistics." The Governor of Maryland has been quoted in the Washington Post as saying that substantially more oil is coming into the United States than is being acknowledged by energy officials. Christopher T. Rand, who is knowledgeable about the Mideast, wrote in the New York of January 3, 1974, that—

The people are in ignorance of the industry's real figures (except those for the prices they pay). They still know absolutely nothing about the true magnitude of America's immense oil and gas reserves . . .

These are representative examples of the information gap that is becoming a dangerous chasm with many people on one side fully believing that the energy crisis a hoax by profit-mad oil companies, and the Congress on the other trying to legislate solutions to a problem that many say is a myth.

It is patently obvious that the country is desperately in need of credible, substantive, and usable information on energy. Accordingly I have introduced a bill which creates a Special Office of Energy Information which is commissioned to prepare a comprehensive inventory of our energy resources. In anticipation of the reluctance of some companies to divulge information which is sensitive, provision is made for the protection of such confidential data.

As with any initial proposal the one I offer is undoubtedly imperfect, but it is a beginning and if we are to intelligently approach our energy problems this bill or something akin to it, is a vital prelude.

H.R. 12176

A bill to provide for the collection and assimilation of information on the energy resources of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Energy Inventory Act of 1974".

SEC. 2. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress hereby finds and declares that:

(1) Available information relating to the various types of energy resources and the quantities of each type is often contradictory and incomplete.

(2) Legislation relating to the utilization and conservation of energy resources must be based upon the most reliable and accurate information possible.

(3) Energy resources are of varied types and are present in a multitude of forms and stages of development.

(4) Information about energy resources is presently diffused throughout the Federal government and different industrial complexes often with conflicting and diverging interests.

(5) Competing industries possess information relating to energy resources and this information is frequently of a sensitive and confidential nature and relates to the competitive aspects of many businesses; further, it is in the interests of the free enterprise system to protect such information as fully as reasonably possible.

(b) PURPOSE.—The Congress hereby declares its purposes to be:

(1) To create an energy resource information center where data relating to all forms and types of energy resources can be collected.

(2) To establish a special office in the legislative branch of the Federal government which will serve as the energy resources information center.

(3) To provide the energy information office with sufficient legal authority to collect and disseminate information as provided in this Act.

(4) To provide adequate safeguards for protection of confidential information.

SEC. 3. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established, on the date of enactment of this Act, a new office in the office of the Comptroller General of the United States to be known as the "Office of Energy Information." This office shall function continuously pursuant to the provisions of this Act until discontinued by an appropriate Act of Congress.

(b) DIRECTOR.—The Office of Energy Information shall be administered by a Director to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall be compensated at a rate to be set by the President, but at a rate not in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code. The Director shall administer and be responsible for the discharge of the functions and duties of the Office of Energy Information. The Director may act through representatives and agents.

SEC. 4. (a) DUTIES.—It shall be the duty of the Director of the Office of Energy Information to prepare and submit to Congress and the President an inventory of the energy resources of the United States. Said inventory shall include, but not be limited to, a comprehensive listing of energy resources, energy supplies, energy processing facilities, energy storage facilities, energy consumption, energy production, energy transmission and transportation system and said inventory shall include appropriate analyses and summaries. The Director shall file a preliminary inventory with the Congress and the President within 90 days of enactment, and he shall submit updated reports every sixty days thereafter.

SEC. 5. ACCESS TO INFORMATION. (a) The Director of the Energy Information Office and his designated representatives shall have authority to acquire whatever data is deemed necessary by the Director for the preparation of the Inventory. (b) All agencies and departments of the Federal Government are directed to cooperate fully with requests for information by the Energy Information Office. (c) The Director of the Energy In-

formation Office and his designated representatives shall be empowered to acquire information through the issuance of subpoena. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the Director of the Energy Information Office and may be served by any duly designated individual. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena by any person who resides, is found, or transacts business within the jurisdiction of any district court of the United States, such district court shall, upon petition, have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to comply forthwith. Failure to obey an order is punishable by such court as a contempt of court. (d) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the withholding of information from any duly authorized committee of the Congress.

SEC. 6. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. (a) Upon being served with a demand for information by the Director of the Energy Information Office, any person may, at the time he submits the information demanded, file a petition with the Director requesting that the information supplied be treated as confidential. (b) Petitions requesting a confidential classification must contain specific identification of the information concerned, and must state particularly why such designation is requested. All petitions must be signed and verified by the person submitting it. (c) The Director shall be the sole determiner of whether or not such petition shall be allowed or disallowed. In either event, the Director shall within 10 days of the date the petition is submitted, serve upon the person signing the petition a written notice of the Director's decision. (d) Information shall be classified and handled as confidential upon a determination by the Director that its publication would do substantive harm to the business operations or competitive position of its proprietor. (e) Information which is designated confidential by the Director shall not be subject to discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, nor shall it be available under any provision of the Freedom of Information Act. (f) Information which is designated confidential by the Director shall not be divulged or published in its raw form. This provision; however, shall not preclude the use of such classified information in the summaries or in the inventory required by Sec. 4 of the Act, but such confidential data shall be incorporated with other data in such a manner as to remove beyond reasonable expectation the possibility of *per se* identification of the information so classified.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for the implementation of the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. The administrator of General Services shall furnish the Office of Energy Information with such offices, equipment, services, and supplies as he is authorized to furnish to any other agency or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

### IS THE ENERGY CRISIS REAL?

**HON. NORMAN F. LENT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess, I had the opportunity to meet with many constituents. A question

which seems to be uppermost in the minds of most of the residents of my district is, "How real is the energy crisis?"

If we are to expect the American people to be willing to sacrifice, we must take every possible step to determine such sacrifice is necessary. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation which would establish a nine member Select House Committee to investigate and monitor the Nation's energy shortage.

My motive in introducing this legislation is not the expectation of adding more oil to supplies which currently exist, but rather to determine with some degree of accuracy just how much petroleum is and will become available. There has been a mounting feeling in recent weeks that the shortage has been contrived by the oil companies in order to force exorbitant increases in the price of gasoline and home heating oil, and I think we need to know beyond any doubt that this "crunch" has not been trumped up.

I hope the investigation I am proposing—or even the promise of close congressional scrutiny—will help clear the air, and produce some hard, reliable figures on which we can project the dimension of the shortage we have to look forward to.

**ALTOONA C OF C DENOUNCES  
BICKERING, URGES SUPPORT OF  
PRESIDENT**

**HON. E. G. SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania could aptly be titled "Little America." I believe the attitudes of the people in my district are representative of the attitudes across America.

This was reaffirmed, recently, when the results of the latest poll conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business were released. The district-wide results varied significantly from that of the entire State of Pennsylvania. But it came as no surprise to me that the results paralleled almost exactly the nationwide figures.

This is important when you take a closer look at how our people feel. And a good gauge of how they feel can be found in a resolution passed by the Altoona Area Chamber of Commerce calling for an end to our "—senseless political bickering," and a "—spirit of Americanism," in which we all join in support of America and back the President.

The Altoona Chamber feels, as I believe most Americans do, that for the good of the country, the confusion of Watergate must be put behind us, and we must look ahead with enthusiasm and the spirit which characterizes our Nation to solving our problems so that we may once again raise our heads high to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the resolution passed by the Altoona Area Cham-

ber of Commerce is so significant, and so reflective of the attitudes of our Nation, that I insert that resolution in the RECORD at this time.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, that the Board of Directors of the Altoona Area Chamber of Commerce calls upon the Congress to cease its harassment of the President of the United States and the consequent disruption of the government of this country, and the distraction which prevents the government from attending to the critical affairs which now demand its attention.

Be it further resolved that this Board of Directors is of the opinion that nothing in the Watergate affair, and nothing so far revealed about the President of the United States warrants this unprecedented effort to hound him into resigning, or otherwise to seek to destroy him as chief of state, the office to which he was elected.

Be it further resolved, that this Board of Directors sees no benefit to this nation, nor aid to the welfare and well being of the people of this nation in this continued and unceasing assault on the presidency; an assault that prevents the normal operation and function of government on urgent affairs which now threaten the welfare of this nation.

Therefore be it resolved that this Board of Directors urges the Congress, for mutual protection and welfare of the people of this nation, to change direction and to turn full attention to the grave problems of the energy crisis, inflation, the advancement of the economy, our trade and other relations with foreign nations especially with Soviet Russia and the Communist bloc, and our national defense.

We suggest, in all sincerity, and in a spirit of Americanism, and with no political prejudice that all join in support of America, and back the President, show unity, and recover the great national strength we are losing in our senseless political bickering.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President, our members of Congress, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce and other civic and business organizations. Adopted this 13th day of December nineteen hundred and seventy-three in Altoona, Pennsylvania.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as the second session of the 93d Congress reconvenes today, I pause in humble gratitude to remember my late friend and colleague, John P. Saylor.

As a freshman Congressman, John Saylor meant much to me and all Alaskans. He was very instrumental in the legislation to grant statehood for Alaska. During the first session of the 93d Congress, he worked tirelessly on the trans-Alaska pipeline legislation, having served both as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as a member of the Alaskan Pipeline Conference Committee.

In addition, John's leadership in the field of conservation was recognized by

most Americans. He was a sponsor of the Wilderness Act to save woods, water, and wildlife. He also backed legislation to establish the Office of Coal Research to find more uses for coal, and was a major supporter of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. He received many awards for his endeavors relating to conservation.

Mr. Speaker, we will miss John Saylor. But we will go forward with our work here in these great Halls, ever thankful for having had the opportunity of knowing this fine man.

GOOD NEWS FOR BOTH AIR FORCE AND TAXPAYER: NEW GD FIGHTER ON SCHEDULE AND UNDER BUDGET

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the January edition of Air Force magazine contains some cheering news for the Nation's taxpayers as well as for the U.S. Air Force.

In a day when it often seems that every new weapons system we try to develop is plagued by overruns in both time and money, there is a new lightweight fighter competition. It is an exciting new concept in this country's efforts to maintain air superiority, and it makes me especially proud because it was conceived and built in Fort Worth by the designers, engineers, and production workers it is my privilege to represent in Congress.

The YF-16 is the subject of a comprehensive article by Edgar Ulsamer, senior editor of Air Force magazine, in the latest issue of that publication. Here are the highlights of that article:

YF-16 ON TIME, ON TRACK, ON BUDGET

(By Edgar Ulsamer)

Early in January of this year, a C-5 Galaxy will deliver to USAF's Flight Test Center at Edwards AFB, Calif., a prototype aircraft that—together with its competitor—is likely to sire a new breed of fighter planes that are small, light, agile, and—perhaps most important—much more economical to own and operate than any fighter in existence today.

The test aircraft is General Dynamics' YF-16. It is scheduled to start a one-year flight-test and evaluation program on or about January 18, 1974. The YF-16 competes with Northrop's YF-17 in the Air Force's Lightweight Fighter Prototype Program (see October '73 issue, p. 64). Each company is building and testing two aircraft under Air Force contract.

The YF-16's vital statistics are impressive. With a mission weight (combat ready after a 500-mile flight) of about 17,500 pounds, the single-engine Mach 2 fighter claims a combat radius about three times that of the F-4, is to accelerate roughly twice as fast, and should permit turn rates about twice as good. The YF-16's average unit cost, based on a hypothetical production run of 300 aircraft coming off the line at a rate of between eight to ten a month, is to be no higher than \$3 million, in FY '72 dollars.

Program Director Lyman C. Josephs, a vice president of General Dynamics' Convair Aerospace Division, told Air Force Magazine

that "on the basis of our experience so far, we believe that we can meet the cost guidelines of the Air Force." This price is predicated on equipment similar to that of the prototypes, consisting in the main of the airframe, engine, head-up display, gun and gunsight, and a simple ranging device. The aircraft's cost could go up by as much as \$400,000, however, if ordered with all-weather avionics.

Col. William E. Thurman, Deputy for Prototypes, Aeronautical Systems Division, AFSC, told this reporter that for this program, the Air Force selected two contractors whose designs explore different technologies. "In the case of the General Dynamics airplane, we are exploring a single-engine design with a single vertical stabilizer and blended wing body to provide high lift as well as a fly-by-wire flight-control system. Both designs test what could be called the weak link in aircraft growth potential, the physiological limitations of man to withstand his G-forces."

In the case of the YF-16, the pilot's seat is tilted back to a thirty-degree angle, instead of the usual twelve to thirteen degrees. According to Air Force studies, this position, which is similar to that provided by a tilted-back chair, shortens the "fluid column" between the brain and the legs and, as a result, boosts the G-force tolerance of the average person by between one and 1½ Gs. There are indications, as yet not verified, that a reclining, raised-heel-line position also improves the pilot's tracking capability, according to Mr. Josephs. Pilot reaction, to date, has been good, both to the YF-16's unconventional seating arrangement and to the side-stick controller, which permits more precise control inputs during combat maneuvers.

HIGH THRUST/WEIGHT RATIOS

The YF-16's thrust-to-weight ratio, according to Colonel Thurman, is about 1:1.3, or similar to that of the F-15. This quality, combined with a wing loading of about sixty pounds per square foot at combat weight, provides the aircraft with "an excellent cruise capability at altitude." General Dynamics spokesmen say that the effective wing loading is considerably less at high angles of attack because of the aircraft's body lift, induced in part by the strakes extending forward from the wing roots. Wind-tunnel tests performed by NASA, Mr. Josephs said, have shown that the aircraft can sustain an angle of attack of thirty-six degrees, claimed to be among the highest ever achieved.

A key element of the YF-16's good thrust-to-weight characteristics is its highly efficient engine, the F100, developed by the Air Force and Pratt & Whitney for the F-15. This engine is a turbofan that produces about 25,000 pounds of thrust with full afterburner. The Air Force left the choice between the F100 and the General Electric YJ101 turbojet engine up to the contractors, but thrust output of these powerplants dictated automatically that the former be used in a single and the latter in a twin-engine configuration. Northrop opted for the GE engine. Mr. Josephs cited the following reasons for choosing a single turbofan engine for the YF-16.

By going to a single engine, General Dynamics believes, it can build a smaller, lighter, and less expensive aircraft.

Militating against the single-engine configuration is the widely held notion that aircraft of this type experience higher attrition rates than multiengine designs. "We think that this is a very emotional subject and, therefore, have painstakingly analyzed all available Air Force and Navy data. We found no evidence of significant differences between singles and twins overall. There is indication of a slight increase in attrition rates in peacetime so far as engine-related accidents are

concerned, but the scatter is so great from one aircraft to the next that it is hard to make a case either way. In addition, the maintenance and operating costs of a single are less than for a twin and, therefore, make up for any slight margin so far as peacetime attrition is concerned," according to Mr. Josephs.

There is evidence that air forces of some allied countries prefer twin-engine designs, but General Dynamics marketing experts believe that the cost advantages of a single-engine design and knowledge of the strong support the F100 is receiving in all R&D and maintenance areas might compensate, at least in part, for these antipathies.

So far as the basic engine design is concerned, General Dynamics aerodynamicists believe that a turbofan's cycle (efficiency at various speeds and conditions) suits the mission of the Lightweight Fighter more than a turbojet. The company's experts believe that a single-purpose aircraft could "benefit from a turbojet engine because it offers some advantages with full afterburner. But if range combined with combat performance and mission flexibility are the driving consideration, the shoe is on the other foot."

#### FLY-BY-WIRE AND CCV

A pivotal innovation of the YF-16 is the use of a fly-by-wire flight-control system, which replaces the conventional mechanical linkage from the cockpit to the actuators of the control surfaces with redundant electronic channels. This in turn has permitted the use of CCV (Control Configured Vehicles) technology, a promising new design technique. CCV designs are aerodynamically less stable under certain conditions, but make up for this by "active" flight controls

Both the Air Force and General Dynamics are confident that there are no undue risks associated with fly-by-wire designs because they are "well within the state of the art."

The Air Force's Flight Dynamics Laboratory has already requested one of the two YF-16 prototypes, upon completion of the flight-test program, for continued research in the fly-by-wire and CCV area. The prospects for these technologies, in the view of General Dynamics, the Air Force, and NASA, are very bright because they make possible the design of smaller and lighter aircraft with higher performance.

Combat performance of the YF-16, in Mr. Josephs' view, will be "excellent. In a dogfight, we believe, we will be able to handle anything that exists today or is on the drawing board."

#### ON COST AND ON TIME

From the Air Force's point of view, one of the most welcome aspects of the Lightweight Fighter Program is the fact, pointed out by Mr. Josephs, that, "at the moment, we are considerably under budget and on schedule. Unless we run into serious trouble during flight testing, we think we will be able to complete the program within the cost ceilings of our contract. The aircraft's empty weight is 400 pounds higher than what we proposed, but the reason for that is that, in the interest of economy, we picked off-the-shelf components, such as the F-111's servos. If we go into production, we would use optimized subsystems rather than components designed for a much larger and heavier aircraft."

General Dynamics shares a key conviction with its competitor, Northrop: Whichever aircraft is chosen by the Air Force as the winner of the flight-test program, and thereby categorized a candidate for eventual series production, "has a real solid chance for overseas sales. Our research indicates that that market may be as high as 2,000 aircraft.

The results of the Lightweight Fighter Program to date, in Colonel Thurman's view, are highly encouraging. "In addition to having developed two very promising aircraft—and we hope that both will meet all the design goals completely—we have acquired a wealth of important design information for a fraction of the cost normally incurred. Also, we have learned or relearned some crucial lessons.

"First, competition is vital. There simply is no other contractual or management incentive that is as effective as competition. Secondly, this program has demonstrated the importance of visibility, the need to bring problems out into the open the minute they occur. Both sides, the Air Force and the contractors, have been scrupulously honest, in a fiscal as well as a technical sense. And third, it is vital that prototypes lead requirements. The results are cost savings and better products."

In this era of shrinking budgets and mounting requirements, the latter two characteristics would seem to be paramount.

#### IT IS YOUR PRIVACY AND LIBERTY

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, as we open the 2d session of the 93d Congress I think it is well for all of us to ask ourselves in what direction are we leading our country toward liberty, or away from it.

One of my favorite newspaper columnists, Margery Burns, from the Minnesota rural Sixth Congressional District, recently wrote on this matter.

I insert her column in the RECORD so that all of our Members may ponder her words. The column follows:

#### IT'S YOUR PRIVACY AND LIBERTY

"Liberty has never come from government. The history of liberty is the history of limitations of government power, not the increase of it." Woodrow Wilson wrote that years ago. "It is in the natural course of events that liberty recedes and government grows." That was written by Thomas Jefferson.

"Experience should teach us to be most on guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding." Justice Brandies made that observation.

So what are we going to do about the way our government takes over more and more of our liberty and privacy?

It is true that as our government has grown bigger and bigger, we have less and less to say as individuals. Do you care if you lose your privacy and your liberty?

Since 1940, our government has grown at a terrific rate. The Federal Government's gross annual revenue rose by 2,780%—from \$7 billion to \$202.5 billion.

The total Federal expenditures went up by 2,140%—from \$10.1 billion to \$226.2 billion.

The Federal debt outstanding rose by 830% from 43 billion to \$477 billion.

Federal expenditures per capita rose by 1,450%—from \$77 to \$1,195.

Federal employment alone has grown to 2,865,303 people.

And . . . Congress passed 13,579 public laws. All of this since 1940!

Out of all this huge growth of government power through hundreds and hundreds of

agencies which have their own rules and regulations, has come data banks, wire-tapping, electronic surveillance, eavesdropping, credit histories, medical histories, income tax information, information systems, regulatory report filing, disclosure statements, data exchanges.

And all this information about you can be passed from government agencies to private sectors and back again to government agencies. The terrible part of this invasion of privacy is the chance that an error can be made about you which will be carried all along the line. And even with correct information about you, your right to privacy is gone. Should you have to put down your "number" on every paper you sign?

This "right to privacy" gone back to 1765 when the English jurist, Lord Camden wrote: "It is not the breaking of his doors, and the rummaging of his drawers, that constitutes the essence of the offense; but it is the invasion of his indefeasible right of personal security, personal liberty."

In the middle of the 19th century, Judge Cooley used the term "the right to be left alone."

Are you concerned about your right to privacy and liberty? Or do you believe that the government should do everything for you and to you? Where do you draw the line? Do you care if your phone is tapped? Or if you are listed in a national data bank? Or if government agencies and private companies can look up your records without your permission?

How much liberty and privacy do you want?

#### THE ARKANSAS RIVER: ITS COLORFUL HISTORY, DEVELOPMENT PLANS, AND NEEDS

### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, most rivers in this country are rich in tradition and history. The Arkansas River is no exception. I would like to share the comments of Col. Donald G. Weinert, district engineer, Little Rock, Ark., District Corps of Engineers, with my colleagues on the history, development plans, and future needs of the Arkansas River:

#### REMARKS BY COL. DONALD G. WEINERT

I appreciate your invitation and the opportunity to trade stories about the Arkansas River. It's really more in that category, not really a speech. I did dig out some little known facts that I find fascinating that you might want to jot down if you talk to people about the history of the river. Then I have an update on information on the present status of the river presented at previous appearances before the Commission; and finally, something on the future of the river as we now see it. I see our good friends in the Coast Guard are here to complement and supplement what I have to say. We do work as hand in glove when it comes to the operation of this river.

One of the first things I found out is that the history of this area of the United States goes back even farther than the bi-centennial of this country. Of course, in 1770 we were talking about French traders and Indians, but still this was quite an active area centered even then on the river. The Arkansas River was quite a different animal in 1770 than it is today, but nonetheless an important part of life in this region of the country.

I don't know if you realize it or not, but

when the United States acquired this territory in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, we paid 11.25 million dollars for that territory which encompasses the central third of the United States and is really the heart land of our country, or a good portion of it. Do you know what it cost to build Lock and Dam No. 4? Just the one lock and dam—20 million dollars minimum, and we have some that went higher than that. When you stop and think about it, the Louisiana Purchase was a pretty good land deal. When we finally attempted to control this river so we could maximize its utility, just one of the 17 locks and dams cost about two times as much as the whole Louisiana Purchase Territory.

Of course this river artery was very important in the early 1800's, and when the steamboat became the big thing, you could go up the rivers almost as easily as down. The steamboat started up the Arkansas early. In fact, and this is another little known fact in history, the Steamboat Comet nosed its way into Arkansas Post in 1820. In 1822 there's a record in the old archives of the Steamboat Eagle on its way up the Arkansas past the village of Little Rock on its way to an Indian Mission in what is now Dardanelle Lake; but it never made it. It ran into some high water and the Corps of Engineers didn't get the channel open in time.

1832 was the first time this river was really acknowledged in a Rivers and Harbors Act. Did you know that in 1832 Congress passed a bill that authorized clearing and snagging on the Arkansas River? They had a Lieutenant as District Engineer at that time who was hampered in his work by no funds. They had the same problems then that we have today, interestingly enough. The first big study that was done in this area was authorized in 1855 by Congress. Congress authorized a study of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. The Corps was supposed to look at the Mississippi River and its tributaries and decide what to do to it so that it could be used to the maximum benefit of the Nation, both for navigation and flood control. The big emphasis at that time was flood control, although navigation was important. How much money do you think they authorized for a study of the Mississippi Basin, the entire Mississippi River and all its tributaries, which includes, of course, the Arkansas? Fifty thousand dollars. Of course, 50,000 dollars today will hardly even do a flood plain study for a city. As you can imagine, all they discovered with that 50,000 dollars was that it was an impossible job. There did not seem any way in the world to harness this animal.

The next big regeneration of interest came after the "27" flood. Of course, many of you in this area are aware that a great deal of local interest began to consolidate in organizations like the Arkansas Basin Association. Some of you were pioneers in those early efforts at generating action on the Arkansas. The "27" flood didn't produce a lot of legislation, interestingly enough. It took the "37" flood to really kick the legislation loose, and following the "37" flood we had some of the most comprehensive river development legislation in the history of this country. In fact, if you look carefully at the authorized projects in the Little Rock District, some of which are still authorized but not constructed even today, that authorization dates to 1938. 1938 was a landmark year as far as Congressional authorization for action; action that was primarily motivated then by a need for flood control.

It wasn't until 1946 that Congress authorized the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System project. Even then the idea of a big navigation system for commercial navigation was really secondary to most people. The real emphasis then was to harness the river to prevent recurrence of the floods of 1927, 1937, or subsequently of

1943 and 1945. It didn't take long in the initial studies in the late 40s for the idea of commercial navigation to really take hold. Some recognized that there was something here that was really worth pushing; and through their influence and with their encouragement, the Corps began to focus more and more on the utilization of this river as a navigation link as part of our inland waterway system. As you all know, it took many years and a lot of dedicated effort, partly from people in this room, and I like to think some competent engineering on the part of the Corps of Engineers, for the dream to be realized. Construction of the largest water resource development project ever undertaken by the Corps finally got underway in 1957. In '69" we opened the culmination of a long history—a river system which is quote "controlled." However, like with any wild beast, control is relative. You may think you've got it controlled but every now and again she proves we don't have her entirely in harness. This last spring was a good example of her proving that.

This river that we opened in 1969 doesn't look at all like that the Comet saw when it nosed its way up in 1820. For one thing, it's not in the same location. If you ever need proof as to the wandering ways of the Arkansas River, get up sometimes and fly over this valley and you will see remarkable patchwork evidence, historical evidence that goes back over hundreds of years, even thousands of years, to show where the Arkansas River has been in the past. Of course, that presented one of the major challenges for controlling it and making it usable. You cannot let it wander if you're going to navigate on it. You really can't let it wander if you're going to go ahead and develop the land adjacent to it and if you're going to control flooding. So the biggest challenge was to get it in a given channel and keep it there. She has been wandering for so many thousands of years, she doesn't like to do that—just stay in one channel. But, overall, I believe we now have the river fairly well regulated.

We are just finishing 5 years of operation. I don't know if you all realize that or not. About 5 years of operation on the river since it was opened in 1969. There is still some recreational development and some bank stabilization work to do and some other things to do regarding navigation operations, but the basic structural control of the river has been complete for about 5 years. I have a summary for you, a few facts and figures as to what it is today—5 years after the project was essentially complete.

In the flood control area, this year alone in the Arkansas portion of the basin about 12 million dollars worth of damages were prevented. That is with the upstream dams in Oklahoma and with the levees and the channel improvement works. The average flood control benefits that were used to justify this project (and it was justified on a cost vs. benefit basis) were 7 million dollars. Benefits this one year alone were nearly two times the average annual benefits. Historical performance in these 5 years shows that the system has produced more annual flood control benefits than we had planned for. Remember, back in the history of this river and of the Mississippi, the flood control problem was the real basic emphasis for the initial interest in legislation. It has done pretty well in what it was designed to do in flood control. We'll not eliminate floods because nobody can predict the amount of rain, but we can certainly control floods, and the project has proven that.

Incidentally, there is one flooding paradox I've talked with the Commission about before. I will mention it again since there are some who may not have been in on those earlier conversations. Colonel Maynard can testify that there wasn't much water when he was here as District Engineer and was building this system. As a matter of fact,

the 60's were pretty dry. About the time they closed the river and finished the bulk of the work in '69, they began to get some rains. Ever since then, every year, including this year which was somewhat of a record event, we've had a lot of water. The water has been backed up on low bank areas where apparently it frequently was in earlier years. Many people's memories may have forgotten that. Many people equated the closing of the river, or the closing of the last lock and dam with the recent high water. From 1969 on, the water has been a lot higher than it was in 1968, 1967, 1966, 1965, and on back, but it is because of rainfall, not the project. It's quite an interesting thing to talk to a farmer who has been farming a piece of land say for 15 years, and tells me honestly that he couldn't remember a time when the water was at that point on his land prior to closing the last dam. I said when did you first start planting, and he said 1961. It is an interesting paradox and it is hard to convince him that the rain, not the project, caused the flooding.

Next, let me talk about recreation. Tom, it sounded like you were giving my flood plain management speech when you started off with the history of our country and our rivers. You brought out something very important—balanced use of this resource. Of course, it was envisioned in the authorization for this project that there would be recreation. I am mentioning this now and I would like particularly the Waterways Commission to focus on what I am saying because I am going to come back to it at the end because there are some challenges here, I think, for the Commission. Recreation is not going away. It is going to be one of the major uses of the river—in terms of numbers of people and numbers of dollars. You say, how could it begin to compete with commercial navigation as a revenue producer or income producer? There were a little over five million readily identifiable recreation users that visited the river last year, when only about half of the total number of parks that we are going to put in had been completed. Five million visitors, and we didn't count them all.

Have you seen the boats on the river this year? I know Jim and his people that have been out trying to operate the tows up and down the river have seen them. It wasn't nearly as bad as I thought it was going to be this year. Maybe the gas shortage, money problems, or other things did keep a few people off the river, but you watch what is going to happen the next few years with the number of recreational boats on the river. We know how many we locked through on a given summer weekend at Murray, and you wouldn't believe it. The same thing at David D. Terry and at No. 13 in the Fort Smith area. Recreation boating, water contact sports, which I agree with Tom, won't be long in coming. Swimming in the Arkansas River and water skiing are already here. Let's be honest about it. You go out on any summer day, and what do you see on the Arkansas River? People swimming and water skiing. It scares me to death and again I'm going to get back to this at the end because it is a challenge to the Waterways Commission. Some guy in one of these jet-powered recreation boats coming out to play on the wake of one of the barges carrying coal down the river or oil up hits that wake and flips and disintegrates. They don't understand that you cannot turn a tow off and stop it dead still. Somebody has to take into consideration what is happening and it has got to be the recreation boat. It cannot be this 1200 horsepower towboat with its 7 or 8 barges or whatever it is pushing because it cannot stop on a dime. We have a transportation problem and again the Waterways Commission has a role to play here.

We now have 36 parks completed on this river and I am talking about just in Ar-

kansas; and 23 are under construction. That means when we are all finished, we will have 59. There are 8 more authorized for future development on a cost sharing basis. Boyd Point is one of these and I think the people of Pine Bluff are aware of this. A total could be as high as 67 parks, Corps of Engineers operated. Actually, not 67 because those 8 would have to be operated by the local entity that cost shared. Many of these are good sized parks, and many of them will be larger than they are now. Some of them are fairly small in the initial stage of development, but ultimately with money and with cost sharing contributions will be a lot larger. We anticipate the visitation to these parks alone in 5 years could easily exceed 7 or 8 million people, just in the Corps operated parks. This is based on our experience and we have experience around our lakes where we have parks of comparable size with comparable facilities. I think the visitation around Table Rock with 21 parks is about 6 million people. We will have 59, ultimately 67 parks along the Arkansas River in Arkansas. It doesn't take much imagination to think what the visitation could be. Just think how much closer these parks are to the major population centers. This recreation is good for the people—the public good, and it is part of the balanced development of the river, something we all need to be thinking about.

I will talk for a minute about power because it does raise its head. There are two power facilities on the river in Arkansas and many more up river in Oklahoma, Dardanelle and Ozark, not big plants, but producers, because they are running-of-the-river and they produce a lot of electricity. Dardanelle has four units of 31,000 KW each and the Ozark unit will have five units of 20,000 KW each. These plants should not interfere with or bother navigation. There is a common misconception that the power people mess up navigation. They do only to the extent they cannot help us get over shoals when the bottom has moved up above project depth. But, when we are at project depth as designed below flat pool, it does not make any difference whether they are generating or not; there will be at least 9 feet below flat pool. So, we are not dependent upon the power people to pass water through Ozark or Dardanelle. When we are in a stage where we have receded from a high flow and we have a lot of shoals, it is helpful for them to give us water through Ozark and Dardanelle. The truth is then they can help us get across an area that is only 5, 6, or 7 feet deep. We have done pretty well this last spring. The first weekend was bad, but we have done better recently on that. Power complements navigation to that extent. It is nice to have it there to help bump over shoals when we need it. Of course, we can also do that ourselves by opening gates at dams where there is no power being generated, but we frequently depend on power releases to put the water in the river to use for that purpose.

Now, I will talk about navigation at present. I have some figures for you that might be of interest. You all know and have seen the chart that I have put up many times that shows the growth of navigation since the river was opened for that purpose. It is about a 45-degree angle and since we are starting low and moving up, it is a big percentage increase each year for the first few years—about 30 percent—and sounds great. It is great; the important thing is that it has been a steady increase. So far this year we have had a bad first 6 months, but I have some interesting news about the last few months. July, including internal tonnage, exceeded July last year. The August total tonnage did not. Internal traffic, rock, sand, and gravel was down in comparison with August last year. Therefore, the total was not as great. But the inbound-outbound traffic,

the items leaving the system and entering the system, the kind of traffic that ultimately we are going to have to depend on for growth in this area as the real bread and butter traffic, was the highest single month's total since the river has been open. September inbound-outbound exceeded that by another 30,000 tons. September is now the highest inbound-outbound month on record. September this year is 24 percent above September a year ago. And now, even considering the first part of the year when things were really tough, we are 4 percent above the first 9 months last year in this inbound-outbound total. The internal traffic, the rock, sand, and gravel, is still down. The biggest increase has been in the petroleum and soybeans. The others are about holding their own, but there is a big drop off in coal. The important part of this statistic is that it shows a remarkable and hoped for increase in commercial use of the river. When you look at last year, November and December, again as those of you on the river remember, were bad months. The total tonnage in November and December of last year was way down. If we have reasonable weather in October, November, and December this year and I would not have believed I could have predicted this 3 months ago, I think that our total tonnage this year is going to come close to our total tonnage last year. We might even maintain that 45-degree growth curve.

We have learned a great deal about navigation. I am not going to belabor what happens after a major rise, but I do want you to know we have documented things a lot better as to where our problem areas are and we are going to run an analysis using our computer when we are all finished to find out where the greatest payoff is as far as dredging. I have every area that has shoaled; how long it was, how long it took to dredge it, how many groundings there were that we know about. With the cooperation of the industry, I have now been able to correlate shoal areas where we had to dredge and groundings. We learned something that surprised everyone in my office. That is, some of the areas that had the worst shoaling, where we were doing the most dredging, were not the areas that had the biggest problem with groundings. The area that had the biggest problem with groundings is where the channel apparently had characteristics about it that lent itself to difficulty for the people operating on the river. We now are beginning to identify where the real problems are as far as we are concerned on channel maintenance, and we are going to confirm this with the industry when we are finished. This channel maintenance tabulation is helpful in another way; it confirmed what I think I told you a long time ago. From the time the water dropped out on the 6th of July and we started to have a rash of groundings, it was the 15th of August or about 40 days until the last large number of groundings occurred. There were some scattered ones up until 4 September, but these were very isolated incidents. The one on the 4th of September happened to be a barge that was well over draft as far as the river capacity so it wasn't too surprising.

Something else came out of the study that I think is encouraging to me and I think the people on this river deserve something of a pat on the back because they have contributed to making it possible. Whatever has happened since I last talked to the Waterways Commission, and whatever efforts you in the Commission and the industry have made, they certainly paid off. Even though there are still channel obstructions, and there are in quite a few places, we have had a remarkable lack of any instances of any kind of serious grounding problems since the 4th of September, and actually since the middle of August when the last big problem occurred. This is in spite of the fact that we have had four dredges working all this time, and they

are still out there, still working, and we still have channel obstructions. The second remarkable thing is that we have had almost no accidents. Last year one of the first things that I got exposed to when I got here was the problem with the dredges not moving, not getting out of the way, and the towboats having trouble with them, colliding with them. Not just the towboats, but recreation boats too. I want you to know there have been almost no such instances, and, Paul, I think the Waterways Commission should take note of this. The industry certainly deserves a pat on the back, also I think the recreation boaters and the dredges do too to some extent. It is so different than before that I really think it deserves commendation and a pat on the back because however it has come about, it is a very commendable record.

We have more bank stabilization to do as I told you, and we are studying now where to put it. We have little odds and ends to do as far as channel maintenance. Whatever we are doing, we will coordinate it with the Commission and with the industry and try to do a good job of it.

Now some other aspects of navigation have to do with river induced development. Again, Tom talked a little bit about this. You all know about the Cerro plant; Wally certainly does, and what that is going to mean. I can give you a dozen similar examples in the State of Arkansas. Your figures, Tom, were from 1960 to 1970. I am no expert in this area, and I have only been here a little over a year, but I can tell you in one year's time what I have seen in terms of people who have either committed themselves or who are about to commit themselves to come into this area. I think you are going to find the growth percentages in the 70's are going to far outstep what you quoted to us in the 60's. It seems to me that we are almost on the verge of a stampede in some areas in terms of people wanting to come in and take advantage of the river and the opportunities it offers, and this presents some real problems. Did you know that we have already permitted 38 ports along the Arkansas River in the State of Arkansas? They call them all ports, but only a few like Little Rock, Pine Bluff, Fort Smith, and Dardanelle I guess you would say are true ports. But, by our definition there are 38 ports and 10 major marinas already permitted, and we have also issued permits for 77 other miscellaneous structures, utility outfalls, and other kinds of items in the river. Now what I am telling you is there are many things going into that river and along that river and it is something that is a joint concern. Tom says in the final analysis of Governor Bumpers, it has to be the local interests, the local governmental agencies, the local planning entities that must decide what should be done and hold their own people to the line. The State can't really dictate this. I certainly agree that it takes this local interest, this local action. That local interest also has to have long range vision and what I would call wide angle lenses on their eyes, because I think it is going to be all of our concern as to how many ports go in along the Arkansas River. I think it is going to be just as pertinent to the people of Pine Bluff as to how many ports there are between Fort Smith and the mouth, as it is to the people of Fort Smith and the people of Little Rock. There has got to be some balance here. How many ports should we have—100, 150, 200, 38? I think the Waterways Commission needs to think about this and I would solicit and urge their consideration of this. It ties to the Governor's desire that the people come to grips with the problems of land use management and development along the river, because that is what you are really talking about when you are making a decision about a port, or a barge loading facility. So, when

someone comes to me individually and says all I'd like to do is dig a little place back in here wide enough for two barges that we can off load, that's just one isolated little request at mile such and such (and I get a lot of those isolated little requests). What do you think that means? Barges are unloading there for some reason, something is coming off of them, something is happening in that area, and it's like that pebble in the water again—the ripples go and go and go. We all need to work together, local entities, local port authorities, local municipalities, the Waterways Commission, the State with its overall guidance, and we with our ultimate authority to say "Yes" or "No" as to whether or not the port goes in there or doesn't go in. We have to decide as to how we want this thing to develop, remembering that we don't want wall-to-wall ports or smokestacks. We do have at least those 59 parks and perhaps a few others, plus the Hollow Bend Wildlife Refuge and a lot of other places, where people can still go and recreate and enjoy themselves; it is a multiple use facility. This river induced development needs to be controlled now, not 10 years from now.

Now the future from my perspective, and again I am no expert in the area of industrial development of commercial development or recreation. I know a little bit about them because we deal with them, and I do have some gut feelings from what I see. If I were going to pick a place that has an unlimited future in this country, it is right here in the heartland of the Arkansas River Basin with that river pointing up into Oklahoma. It has potential uses that have not been conceived yet. You do not disrupt existing transportation patterns overnight.

You do not suddenly stop using established rail or highway transportation patterns just because somebody has built a 1.2 billion dollar water system that goes to Catoosa. But ultimately, those patterns will change; maybe not in the first 5 or 10 years. You know in our studies for this river, they projected at the time the study was done, and it went back to 1954, that this area could support commercial river traffic up to 13 million tons a year. That was based on then existing economic conditions as reasonably projected. The truth is, last year by 1972 we were already over 6 million tons, and this year it may be over that if we get decent weather the next 3 months. My point is that no one looking at it now would begin to predict that the 13 million tons is the upper limit. In fact we now see that we are going to pass that probably very soon. Now what the upper limit is the State or somebody will have to recompute because it will be based on the now existing economic conditions. The future as we now see it, and things like the energy crisis all enter into this picture. It is a different picture than it was 15 or 20 years ago. Again, the untouched development potential in this part of the country offers one of the last oases to industry in the United States, one of the last places they can come. Even now, they find it a hard enough time getting enough employees because the job market here is getting tight. The boom is being felt here too, but the potential is here. I think you will see that potential realized in the future.

We need some improvements as I told you at first along the river. We need to get better fleeting area facilities outside the major ports. Right now, we have only identified two or three, but I would anticipate within the next 5 years we may develop others that need to have fleeting areas. We need mooring facilities upstream on all the locks and dams, and eventually downstream on all the locks and dams. We need them upstream above all the movable bridges. We are working in that direction in our programming. Let me enter one note of caution there. You all are aware of the national crisis

as regards to inflation and the tremendous desire to hold down Federal spending. None of us should be naive enough to think that those pressures do not exist in all Federal agencies and do not affect all of our programs. Our program is there, but I think it is going to be tough to get the money that we would like for the next few years. It is not just us, I think the Coast Guard will agree they are feeling the same kind of pressures; any Federal agency would agree that they are facing the same kind of difficulties. We know that we need more bank stabilization; we need some safe harbors, particularly in Dardanelle and Ozark; we need to solve the mooring problem at intervening points in the pools; and we need to find out how that is going to be done. We are all working toward all of these. We need to make sure that all the dikes that are half submerged or all submerged are marked in some way. We need to figure out a more permanent way of marking the navigation channel at higher flows. The Coast Guard and I have been talking about that. We will find a solution. These things will make it even better and easier to navigate.

What does this mean? This means that the pressures for use and development are going to get greater and greater. There are going to be more recreational boats each year, more potential interference with commercial traffic. I can envision the day when we will have to schedule lockages for recreational boats, and the day may not be too far away, in order to make sure we do not interfere with commercial traffic. We are going to need help to make sure the river is developed the way the local people want it and the way the State wants it. We are there as the tool, the servant, to do it. We are looking to the local interests, the Waterways Commission, and the State for guidance as to how you want it. We are a Federal agency operating and maintaining a system.

We are going to need your help on the safety issue. We need to learn how to control recreation boating, put some teeth in laws perhaps. There are going to be conflicts, but they have to be faced. We are going to need your help in identifying where the ports should go and how many there should be. I am talking now specifically to the Waterways Commission; I am asking for help. Throughout this, I say "we"—I am really saying the Corps and the Coast Guard, because we have to work together to solve all of these problems, the channel markings, the port locations. They all influence both the Coast Guard and us. I am asking for your help and offering our absolute cooperation. When we get through, the sky is the limit. There is, as I see it, great potential for development along this river. The kind of development that years from now, Tom and all of us would like to look back on and say, "We are proud of it, we did it the way we really wanted to do it. It did not run us, we ran it."

ANDREW M. LEWIS, JR.

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, January 10, the State of Maryland lost one of its most distinguished sons with the passing of Andrew M. Lewis, Jr., president of the Maryland-District of Columbia AFL-CIO.

Andy Lewis first entered the labor movement as an official with Local 180 of the United Glass and Ceramics Workers of North America, which he joined while

employed at PPG Industries in his native Cumberland, Md. He was elected president of that local and later secretary-treasurer of the Maryland-District of Columbia AFL-CIO. Last August he was elected president of that organization.

Andy will be missed not only by those who knew him and worked with him in the labor movement but also by his many friends in Cumberland. He was a trustee of Allegany Community College, a member of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Unemployment Security, and a board member of the Allegany County United Fund. Andy Lewis' family and friends, I am sure, are proud of his many achievements in Cumberland and the State.

CONGRESSMAN WOLFF'S NEWS-  
LETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I distribute a newsletter to my constituents in a continuing effort to keep them up to date on my activities in Washington as their representative and to get the benefit of their thinking on major issues. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to share my most recent newsletter with my colleagues for their information:

NEWSLETTER

Dear Friend and Constituent,

Today, there is often little opportunity for the average citizen to have a voice in the decision-making process of our government, but you may be assured that your concerns and views on current issues are of paramount importance to me as your Representative in Washington.

In recent months you received two separate opinion surveys in my newsletter—surveys I undertook in the sincere hope they would serve as a direct line of two-way communication with you to provide me with a knowledge of your sentiments. The replies I have received indicate this purpose has been well met and again I thank those of you who participated.

This newsletter focuses on the results of these surveys and a summary of my views and current actions in the Congress relevant to each question and answer. There were 3245 responses to the first survey, a 2.3 percent return which is considered average by direct mail standards.

(Q.) What do you consider to be the three most serious problems affecting your community today?

(A.) 1. Crime and drugs, 40.9%; 2. Inflation and cost of living expenses (food, medical, etc.), 37.2%; 3. Property taxes, 9.7%; other, 12.2%.

This survey (taken before the energy crisis peaked) indicated that the spread of violent crime and drug abuse and the plight of innocent victims of crime remain the number one concern in both our suburban and urban communities today. I am convinced, more than ever, that the only way we will stem this growing incidence of crime is to attack the root of the evil by beefing up our law enforcement training and manpower programs, eradicating the drug menace at its source, providing greater employment and housing opportunities and by strengthening our penal system through court reform and rehabilitation services. However, our citizens

must be protected while we strive to effect changes needed to erase the social ills that spawn crime.

Legislation I co-authored to provide tax deductions to cover costs of installing crime prevention devices in homes and businesses and to afford tax relief for theft losses and related medical expenses is to be included by the House Ways and Means Committee in the new tax reform measures to come before Congress this session.

As Chairman of the House Subcommittee on International Narcotics Control, I am gratified to report that my amendment to impose trade sanctions against foreign nations that do not cooperate in our efforts to halt the narcotics traffic has been included in the 1973 Trade Reform Act and that my proposal to mandate strict control over the manufacture and distribution of acetic anhydride, the essential ingredient in the production of heroin, has been adopted by Interpol, the international police organization. I intend to vigorously pursue this frontal attack on the illegal traffic of drugs to our shores for I believe that if we are to curb "crime in the streets", we must first contain the wave of drug addiction that is responsible for more than 70 percent of the lawlessness in our communities today.

Our courts also must share a greater responsibility by imposing more meaningful prison sentences on convicted criminals—not merely periods of time subject to early parole, as so often is the case. In reality, the procedure of early parole acts as an inducement for the criminal-minded to pursue illegal acts upon his release. Prison terms should be consistent with the crime and provide as well for increased rehabilitation efforts.

(Q) Do you favor federal controls over the sale of weapons?

(A) Handguns: yes, 88%; no, 9%; no opinion, 3%. Shotguns and rifles: yes 76%; no 19%; no opinion, 5%. Dangerous knives: yes, 84%; no, 10%; no opinion, 6%.

I believe, too, that we must curtail the easy availability of firearms and other weapons. As you are aware, Congress has passed a number of measures to curb the mail order traffic in long guns and pistols but they are only half-steps that do not meet the problem head-on. I am hopeful that stronger measures will be enacted soon to deal with the registration and licensing of all firearms and ammunition. In addition, I recently introduced legislation to prohibit the mail order sale of switchblade and other dangerous knives to minors, a follow-up move to my bill calling for a ban on the manufacture and distribution of these murderous weapons which, in no way can be categorized as hunting or fishing tools—they have no other purpose than to threaten or kill.

(Q) What new federal legislation would you like Congress to enact?

(A) Stronger anti-crime and narcotics laws, greater gun control, strict penalties for convicted criminals and court revision, 39.1%; tax reforms to include the elimination of farm subsidies, oil depletion allowances and tax "loopholes", 15.6%; increased Social Security benefits for the aging, 13.1%; curbs on inflation with price, wage and rent controls, 12.7%; other (national health insurance plan, federal laws to control political campaign contributions, public financing of campaigns, curbs on Presidential powers, aid to education, mass transit, pension and welfare reform), 19.5%.

In the area of long overdue tax reform, I support measures to plug "loopholes" and assure that every person pays fair and equitable federal taxes. I am sponsoring efforts to effect tax relief measures for the overburdened wage earner, homeowner, tenant and

the elderly. In brief, I believe the Congress should enact legislation to include:

Tax deductions for commuters who use mass transit to travel to work;

Federal income tax deductions for persons who rent their principal residence, for homeowners who make domicile heating improvements (insulation) and install anti-crime devices;

Tax exemptions on the first \$5,000 of annual retirement income, tax credits for the cost of higher education and non-public school tuition, and the removal of income tax inequities for single persons and for married persons, both of whom must work.

I continue also to oppose the program of farm subsidies, the system that pays our farmers not to produce food while we continue to export vast quantities of foodstuffs, particularly feed grains, abroad and there are shortages of these commodities here at home. I am most hopeful that my bill to embargo these shipments will receive prompt congressional action, for these continuing exports will only result in a further drain on our nation's resources.

I have also introduced legislation to embargo the exports of American oil and oil products until such time as the energy shortage is alleviated in this country. It seems incredible to me that we continue to deplete our resources as we face shortage and possible rationing.

A subsequent question was asked in a special newsletter you received in November to ascertain your opinion of impeachment proceedings. This questionnaire resulted in a total 21,424 replies, a 15.5% return—an outpouring that clearly demonstrates deep citizen interest in this serious matter.

(Q) Do you favor impeachment of the President of the United States?

(A) Yes, 48.8% (43.8% for impeachment, 5% for resignation); no, 50.2%; no opinion, 1%.

I undertook this second survey, not only to gain your views but, more important, to specifically provide you with a vehicle to express your opinions to the House Judiciary Committee, now in the process of holding hearings on whether or not there is justification for the full House to consider impeachment proceedings. I believe your opinions should be voiced.

I believe it is vitally important in our democracy to have all voices heard and for government representatives to provide opportunities for citizens to express their opinions and to offer suggestions for resolving problems.

There were some who took exception to my even conducting this survey since they felt it was placing the President on trial and pre-judging him.

Very simply, the impeachment process means that initially, an investigation and airing of the facts is undertaken by the House of Representatives to determine if sufficient prima-facie evidence exists to call for a trial by the United States Senate. Guilt or innocence is not determined in the House of Representatives.

Personally, I believe, as do many of my colleagues, that the Judiciary Committee should proceed with its hearings as rapidly as possible to determine if further action by the House or Senate is warranted.

#### TIME CHANGE

Ask Your Congressman, the non-partisan, public service radio show moderated each week by Congressman Wolf, may now be heard in the tri-state area every Sunday afternoon at 5:30 PM over WOR. The program features Congressional and civic leaders discussing issues of local and national concern.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF

## RHODESIAN CHROME HYPOCRISY

### HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with all the talk about measures to solve the energy crisis, and terrorists' hijackings very little has been printed about the debate in the Senate on Rhodesian chrome. There is always a new crisis waiting around the corner, and in my opinion, the Senate action in restoring the ban on the importation of Rhodesian chrome ore will precipitate added economic chaos in the United States.

Our own natural resources—metal ores, crude oil, et cetera—are depleted, and we rely more and more on foreign supplies to our industries. The present fuel shortage due to the Arab boycott and our inadequate domestic supplies is evidence of this. Yet even as we are slowing down, and turning out lights, and lowering thermostats to survive this cut-back, the U.S. Senate acts to boycott the major free world source of chrome. It just does not make good commonsense.

Ostensibly the United States is merely conforming to the United Nations boycott against Rhodesia which was instituted in 1967 to force the white Rhodesian Government to allow more participation by the 95-percent black population. I have absolutely no objection to urging Rhodesia to alter its governmental policies but why should our economy suffer further damage to do this?

Social progress follows economic progress. Poverty ridden countries have too much trouble surviving to devote much time to social reform. The United States is going to feel a lot more realistic and less idealistic if the predicted 17-percent shortage of fuel materializes next year.

Besides why are we getting so picky about whom we deal with? I am sure all Americans remember the notorious wheat deal we made with the Russians last year. We bent over backward to sell them wheat to the detriment of our own citizens. We would have to go some to find a government more repressive than the Soviet Union.

If the House also passes the restoration of the ban on importation of Rhodesian chrome the United States will once more be bending over backwards on a "do-gooder" errand which will help no one and hurt the U.S. citizen.

Economic sanctions are not particularly successful diplomatic weapons. The U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia can probably be regarded as a failure. They were in effect for 5½ years with our support and did not achieve their objective. In fact, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the British Foreign Secretary, told Parliament on June 13, 1972 that:

Exports from Rhodesia have recovered to 97% of what they were before sanctions were imposed.

When we subsequently removed the ban on importing chrome all that happened was that the Russians lost business. The Soviet Union was the source of nearly 60 percent of U.S. chrome imports in 1969 and 1970.

If the ban on importation of Rhodesian chrome is restored we will have to switch our business from Rhodesia to Russia since the only other major suppliers—Turkey and South Africa—are already being utilized. Either government is bad, but, in my opinion, dealing with the Russians is just as morally bad as dealing with the Rhodesians.

There are those who feel we should honor our obligations to obey the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia to set an example for the world as a law abiding Nation. This is ridiculous. Only industrial nations need chrome and most of the members of the U.N. cannot be considered industrial nations. They give up nothing, but they point an accusing finger at us and we relinquish our sovereignty and behave against our best interest to assuage them. One does not have to be a genius to see that if we keep doing things against our economic interests that we are not long going to be a rich and powerful Nation. Without wealth and power how long can we be persuasive morally?"

THE COUNCIL OF IRELAND: REGRESSION OF PROGRESS TOWARD A NEW IRELAND

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much controversy on the subject of the new Council of Ireland as a basis for the future reunification of Ireland, already rejected by Unionists extremists who threaten to fight England to remain British and by Irish Republican followers of the ideals of Patrick Pearse and the Easter 1916 Rising, it is also coming into serious question in the middle ground. Nor has the debate been confined to the other side of the Atlantic; it excites debate in the United States as well. The Council of Ireland is not really new, it was created in theory by the British Government of half-a-century ago but never seriously implemented until the present. It was a part of the treaty which created the Irish Free State and the temporary partition of Ireland. Since that time, partition has acquired the attributes of permanence and the Council of Ireland seemed to have been forgotten until last year.

If nothing had changed in Dublin during the intervening 50 years, then its implementation this year would only be the long-overdue observance of an old treaty. But all is not the same in the Ireland of the 1970's as it was in the 1920's.

The Dublin government is no longer a self-governing dominion within the British Empire recognizing the King or Queen of England as Head of State. In

1936, the Dublin government disestablished the Irish Free State and, under the leadership of Eamonn deValera, established the Eire constitution. Dr. Douglas Hyde, a Protestant nationalist, was its first president. In 1949, the Dublin government, led by Sean MacBride, established what is known as the Republic of Ireland. For over two decades, the Dublin government has been operating in the form of a Republic whose Head of State is an elected Irish president—presently Erskine Childers, a Protestant who formerly represented a constituency in County Monaghan, a part of Ulster which is not under direct British rule—which enjoys diplomatic relations with the United States, which is a full sovereign member of the United Nations organization, and which constitutionally claims sovereignty over all of Ireland.

Things are indeed different today. What would have been a progressive step for the Irish Free State of the 1920's appears to be regression for a Republic of Ireland. Acceptance of these new Sunningdale agreements over 60 years after the House of Lords rejected Home Rule for Ireland would be somewhat analogous to President of the United States Andrew Jackson ignoring the Revolution and the Declaration of Independence of the Fourth of July 1776 and reentering the British Empire on terms which might have been acceptable to the First Continental Congress in 1774.

The Sunningdale agreement errs, perhaps fatally, by seeking to legitimize the artificial gerrymander of six of Ulster's nine counties; by denying the sovereignty of the Republic of Ireland Government over all of Ireland; by failing to give the long-sought declaration of intent by the British Government to respect the will of the people of Ireland. I fear that, however well-intentioned they might be, the participants in the Sunningdale conference may have sown the seeds of continuing and future conflict in unhappy Ireland because their gaze was fixed upon the past and not the future. I fear that they have not laid the basis for a just and lasting peace in a new Ireland any more than did those who signed the tragic Treaty of December 6, 1921, or the Boundary Agreement of December 3, 1925.

A prominent 25-year member of the Irish House of Representatives—the Dáil Éireann—Mr. Neil Blaney, T. D. of County Donegal—another part of Ulster not under direct English rule—has warned that the coming of the British Army or the Royal Ulster Constabulary "even one inch into" the Republic's "territory with or without the consent of the Government—or the Council of Ireland, is a complete breach and a sell-out of the sovereignty of this country." There can be no compromise on this, he added.

The picture, however dismal, is not totally dark. A ray of light has broken through the clouds. It is possible for Ireland to be at peace, united, sovereign and free, and still accommodate the Protestant-Unionist minority's integrity and interests. I submit for your consideration the outline of an Irish federal system as articulated by New York State Senator

John E. Flynn of Yonkers, on pages 8 and 10 of the September-October 1973 issue—volume XL, No. 5—of *The National Hibernian Digest*. Senator Flynn is a member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, long active in Irish affairs. The title of his article is "Toward a New Ireland."

The article follows:

TOWARD A NEW IRELAND

(By Senator John E. Flynn)

Most of the attention of the world is focused upon the present "troubles" in those Six of divided Ulster's Nine Counties known as "Northern Ireland." While this is the immediate concern of all right thinking men, the present troubles are but the symptoms of the disease, not its cause.

One of the root causes of Ireland's problems lies in its present governmental structure. Six Counties in the North-East of Ulster, the historic Northern province are occupied by a foreign power, and administered in the interest of that foreign power. The remaining Twenty-Six Counties enjoy a measure of freedom and are directly ruled and administered by a centrally organized government in Dublin, and are known as "the Republic of Ireland."

While the present constitution of the Twenty-Six County state is very good, in fact excellent, for its type, that is for a centralized government; it has a great intrinsic weakness in that it is an Irish adaptation of the governmental form set up by foreigners to rule Ireland in the interest of another country. The native Irish genius had previously created a decentralized form of government, under which Ireland was run by and for the Irish people.

The Gaelic system of law and political organization was based upon the principle of subsidiarity; that is that anything which could be accomplished in the private sector was left to the private sector and things in the public sector were treated at the lowest echelon possible. Government was, in other words, decentralized. Presiding over Ireland was a High King (Árd Rí), who led the nation in national affairs, presided over the triennial Árd Pheis, whose office was elective, but who did not directly govern the people in their domestic affairs. In addition to the province of Meath (An Midhe), which was the High King's official balliwick (a similar idea to our District of Columbia wherein is located the Seat of Government of the United States), where the four provinces of Ulster (Ulaidh), Leinster (Laignin), Munster (Mumhain) and Connacht (Connachta) which were somewhat analogous to our own States save that in Ireland sovereignty was always the attribute of the nation as a whole, never divided among its subsidiary parts. This was a functioning system then long before the first Saxon ever set foot on Britain.

The decentralization of the Irish system made conquest by foreign invaders a most difficult proposition, for even if the foreigners were able to capture the High King in his capitol (e.g. Tara), that is all that they would have, and the rest of the country could continue to function. The Normans invaded England in 1066 and conquered it in short order. The Norman invasion of Ireland began in 1169, over eight centuries ago, yet did not achieve even the outward appearance of political success until early in the seventeenth century nearly half a millennium later. Even this success has not been permanent as each succeeding generation of Irishmen has asserted their right to national freedom, often in arms and blood, right down to the present day.

We in the United States are doubly fortunate: First, and most obviously, that we have achieved our freedom and independence

from England, as we declare on the 4th of July 1776; and, second, that the founding fathers of this great American republic understood and employed such principles as subsidiarity, separation and division of powers, and limited government. Ireland, of course, is not America, nor do we suggest that a new Ireland, united and free, adopt a carbon copy of the Constitution of the United States. But there are those sound, proven principles which underlie both the American constitutional tradition and the ancient Gaelic political system which are worthy of consideration in the building of a new Ireland, an Ireland not for foreign imperialists but for the Irish.

We are, therefore, most favorably impressed by the Provisional Republican plan for provincial assemblies and regional and local government to deal with matters at the level at which they will be both most clearly understood and most efficiently handled. This must be, of course, under the sovereignty of an all-Ireland, 32-county, united Irish Republic combined with constitutional guarantees of individual human rights and liberties in the form of an Irish "Bill of Rights" or Charter of Rights. Thus far, this is the most effective and progressive plan for the decentralization of government and the protection of local and minority rights, liberties, and interests in a free and united Ireland in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity.

We can only hope that the good work of such men as Dáithí Ó Conall and Ruairí Ó Brádaigh of Sinn Féin in setting up regional governments in Ireland—Dáil Uladh (Ulster, the North), Dáil Connacht (Connacht, the West), Dáil Laighean (Leinster, the East), and Dáil na Mumhan (Munster, the South)—will bear fruit and help restore peace and the ancient prosperity of Ireland. Ulster is, of course, the special test case. The establishment of Dáil Uladh would be the first step towards the creation of this new governmental structure for the whole island. By thus creating a Provincial Parliament for the nine counties of Ulster within a new united Ireland, the partition system would be disestablished and the problem of the border removed. Dáil Uladh would be representative of Catholic and Protestant, Orange and Green, left and right. It would be an Ulster parliament for the Ulster people. The presently Unionist-oriented people of Ulster would have a working majority within the province and would therefore have considerable control over their own affairs (They would also have constitutional guarantee of civil and human rights, which guarantee is visibly absent under English rule.) That power would be the surest guarantee of their civil and religious liberties within a new Ireland (Éire Nua).

A Federal Parliament, a new Dáil Éireann, representative both of the people and the provinces (as the Congress of the United States is representative both of the people and the states) would control all enumerated powers and functions essential to the good of the whole nation. An independent judiciary as the guardian of the Constitution and the common law would be essential. Ireland would, at long last, be able to function for the Irish people, in a true, Gaelic, republican-democratic tradition.

The Irish nation, like other nations, has the right of national self-determination. The only solution to the Irish question is a free and independent, united Ireland. Like the Jews, who say "never again", the Irish have painfully reached the conclusion that their lives, their property, their livelihood, their liberties, their language, and their culture can never be safe under alien rule. Therefore, in accordance with the proclamation of 1916, and for reasons more compelling even than those enumerated in the American Dec-

laration of Independence in 1776, they are committing an act of self-defense, to establish in fact that Irish Republic proclaimed by Patrick Pearse on Easter Monday, 1916, ratified by the Irish electorate in the general election of 1918, and established DE JURE by the First Dáil Éireann in 1919. What the IRA is fighting for is the restoration of a united, independent, Irish Ireland; not free merely, but Gaelic as well, not Gaelic merely, but free as well.

Let us all pray and work earnestly for the end to violence which is the unhappy symptom and the peaceful establishment of the cure, a new Ireland, of, by and for the Irish.

#### SHAKOPEE COUNCIL OPPOSES GASOLINE TAXES

#### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Congress, my office here in Washington received a resolution from the Common Council of Shakopee, Minn., in my congressional district regarding the possibility of legislation being enacted which would allow gasoline taxes to increase as a rationing device. I ask that the council's resolution follow my remarks. The Shakopee Council is strongly opposed to an increase in the gasoline tax levy as a rationing device. To this point in the energy crisis we have gotten by merely with allowing the price mechanism to play its role in rationing supply by diminishing demand. Hopefully, the administration will not have to take the step of asking for increased fuel taxes as a rationing device and will be able to explore, as the Shakopee Council suggests, other methods of allocation. The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION No. 729

A resolution opposing the enactment of laws imposing additional gasoline taxes as a measure to control the gasoline supply

Whereas, There is presently both federal and state legislation under consideration for proposing to Congress and the Minnesota Legislature respectively, the enactment of additional gasoline taxes as a measure to control the gasoline supply at all levels; and

Whereas, This method of controlling the gasoline supply discriminates against the middle and low income citizens;

Therefore, be it resolved by the common council of the City of Shakopee, That, it goes on record herewith opposing the enactment of laws that would impose or tend to impose additional gasoline taxes for the purpose of controlling the gasoline supply at all levels, either by the Congress or by the Minnesota Legislature, or both, and urges that a study of other means of controlling the gasoline supply for the duration of the crisis be explored.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be immediately forwarded by the City Recorder-Administrator to U.S. Senators Walter F. Mondale and Hubert H. Humphrey, and Congressman Ancher Nelsen; and to State Senators James F. Lord, Earl W. Renneke and Clarence Purfeerst and State Representatives Richard J. Menke, Robert E. Vanasek and Carl M. Johnson.

Passed in Adj. Reg. session of the Common Council of the City of Shakopee held this 18th day of December, 1973.

#### IMPEACHMENT AND THE MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD

#### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call a disturbing and challenging article from the Los Angeles Times by Mr. Charles Mee to the attention of my colleagues. Along with the poll results reported by Evans and Novak in today's Post, it raises the unpleasant possibility that the corruption of Watergate has spread much further than the National Government.

Mr. Mee reports that the nonpolitical elite who should be providing leadership are afraid to act on their convictions. They are afraid of the Government and they are afraid of the people. On a wider level, they are repeating the well-known Watergate syndrome: smile bravely, deny everything, and hope that things do not get out of hand.

Even more discouraging, Evans and Novak disclose poll results showing that the whole Nation may be succumbing to the pattern. These results show a fear of removing Mr. Nixon based on complete despair of even the possibilities of the system.

I believe that we much-maligned "politicians" should realize we have a stake in the matter. Mr. Nixon is bringing us all down with him. More than anybody else in the country, we will have to live with the failure to vindicate the honor and standards of our political system. I believe a sense of the meaning of our shared profession should be stronger than the partisan issues that separate us.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 2, 1974]

ONLY LEFT, RIGHT HAVE SPOKEN UP ON IMPEACHMENT: WHY THE SILENCE FROM MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROADERS?

(By Charles I. Mee, Jr.)

A director of one of the world's largest business corporations is afraid of retaliation. A former general—with heretofore undisputed courage—is afraid that the Internal Revenue Service will harass him. A former American ambassador is afraid that his passport will be revoked. A distinguished American poet, with tenure on a university faculty, is afraid that government funds will be cut off for one of his programs.

All these people favor the impeachment of President Nixon but will not take a public stand—because they are afraid. In my capacity as chairman of the National Committee on the Presidency, which is a group of citizens in the political center which favors impeachment, I have corresponded or talked by phone with these and several hundred other middle-of-the-roads. My small private "poll" has shown a larger percentage of people in favor of impeachment than the Gallup or Harris polls indicate.

My inquiries have found many people willing to step forward to take a public position for impeachment—people such as Alfred Knopf, Brig. Gen. Samuel B. Griffith II and Orville H. Schell Jr., president of the New York City Bar Assn. Indeed, Schell called his own press conference to announce his views. But the more stunning, and dismal, finding of my little poll is that fear has eat-

en into the established, non-elective leadership of our country.

Some leaders are afraid of personal reprisal. Others are afraid of the dire consequences if an impeachment effort should fail. Still others fear the unpredictable behavior of a threatened and cornered President. But, whatever the form it takes, or whatever may be the object to which it attaches itself, the stark fact is that fear—the fear of free citizens to behave freely—has become far more pervasive than I had realized.

Most of those to whom I have spoken believe that sufficient *prima facie* evidence is now before the public to justify—and, in the view of many, to require—impeachment. And those pro-impeachment respondents perceive the enormous stakes involved.

Wall Street brokers, bankers, lawyers, former justices and politicians have told me, over and over again, that the President has practiced assault and battery upon the very foundations of the law of the land; that to allow this Administration to wield irresponsible power with impunity will lead in the end to another form of government; that to fail to halt and reverse the precedents set by this Administration invites future Presidents, if not this one, to practice naked tyranny; that we must, in short, use our Constitution—or face the threat of losing it. It is considerations of this magnitude that are smothered by fear.

Fear does not, of course—not yet—intimidate those many anonymous men and women whose responses to Gallup and Harris pollsters indicate an ever-growing popular desire to bring the President to trial before the Senate and force all the evidence into the open. Nor has fear inhibited the American Civil Liberties Union or George Meany from campaigns for impeachment.

It is strange, however, to become aware of the uneasy silence that grips so many nationally known figures of the center to whom we would otherwise be looking for leadership.

Whether, depending upon our biases, we applaud or deplore the existence of an "establishment" within a democracy, an establishment does indeed exist in the United States—though it generally prefers to be called an "elite."

In any case, whatever it may be called, one man who stands at the very center of that group, and from whom a great many people of like mind, particularly on the East Coast, take their cue, has warned privately, "This is no time to let loose the wolves."

By "the wolves," he means the people, the mob.

It is apparent that one fear running through the old establishment is its perennial distrust of ordinary people. The man who's afraid of the wolves can read the Gallup and Harris polls as well as anyone else—but he sees in them not a heartening reaction from the grass roots but the threat of a popular uprising. More than anything else, it may be this fear that has paralyzed so much of the "elite."

History shows that elites must earn their favored positions, and continue to deserve them if they are to retain power. In the broadest historical terms, we may be seeing the first symptoms of the collapse of the traditional elite in our country. It is collapsing in slow motion, locked in fear and foreboding, suffering from that fatal disease the British classical scholar Gilbert Murray called "a failure of nerve."

History judges not only politicians and their actions; history also judges the people who, by their action or inaction, by their vociferousness or their silence, sustain those politicians in office.

Some years hence, long after Watergate had faded from memory, long after our bicentennial anniversary has passed in dis-

quietude and anguish, history will judge our generation very harshly—first its elite, and second, unless a brighter and more capable group arises to assume that role, the people in general.

The traditional liberal-left groups in our country have joined against the President. Indeed, many of them favored the President's impeachment the day after he took office. Some would be rid of him, whether he is guilty of any wrongdoing or not. Some made up their minds long ago: They are, in my view, lamentably prejudiced. And on the right there are many who will hear no evil of the President, for he can do no wrong.

And so legions on the left and the right have responded once again to the call to battle, this time on one of the gravest issues the country has ever faced—an issue that finally involves the very form of government under which we and our children shall live.

Yet, at this time—momentous in terms of history—the nation needs calm, moderate, mature counselors who fly to no easy solutions, who have the ability to face hard, tortuously hard problems and press them to conclusion, who can be counted on to act with integrity, decency common sense and above all, with courage.

More than anything, the people of the center must now step forward to insist that the fundamental law of the land prevail, that basic right will not be lost by contemptuous encroachments, that leaders shall be accountable to the people, that integrity and honor shall be restored to the White House and that we shall no longer, as a people, be shamed by our President.

The committed liberals have been heard from and so has the old hard core on the right. Now it is time for those of us in between, whose main commitment is to constitutional government, to demand an accounting.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1974]  
SCANDAL? THEY LIKE IMPEACHMENT EVEN LESS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

NEWARK, OHIO.—No sooner had the latest Watergate bombshell exploded in Washington than weathervane voters here reached this paradoxical conclusion: of course the White House deliberately erased the 18-minute tape segment, but Richard M. Nixon still should complete his term as President.

This attitude permeated our interviews, conducted with the help of Oliver Quayle's polling organization, in Precinct "D" of Ward 3, a barometer of state and national election results. An overwhelming majority of these voters regard Mr. Nixon as a liar, a tax chiseler and a poor President. Yet, they oppose even the start of impeachment proceedings, much less removal from office.

Underlying this seeming contradiction is pervasive, deepening skepticism that any successor to Mr. Nixon would improve things much. Consequently, nothing short of proven criminal conduct is likely to inflame public opinion in favor of the President's removal.

The barometer precinct, selected for us by election analyst Richard Scammon, consists largely of blue-collar workers who supported Mr. Nixon in 1972. But among the 70 residents interviewed the day after technical experts reported the apparently deliberate erasure of the 18-minute segment of conversation between Mr. Nixon and H. R. Haldeman, four out of five feel that the White House deliberately destroyed evidence.

This comports generally with answers to a questionnaire prepared for us by Quayle researcher Jonathan Lovell. The President gets a job approval from these 70 voters of only 27 per cent. The vast majority believe Mr. Nixon did not pay his fair share of taxes, has lied about Watergate and has suffered seriously in capacity to govern because of Watergate.

Most shocking, only 7 of the 70 voters believe Mr. Nixon first learned of the Watergate burglary when he said he did. But 34 believe he knew about it before it was planned—a charge nobody has ever made.

These harsh views are held by a 39-year-old government worker who voted for Mr. Nixon but now says: "I think he's dishonest. He's just a crook in every way." Another 1972 Nixon voter, a young steel worker, feels Mr. Nixon has done poorly because "there's too much scandal. He should have been able to clear himself when it first came to light."

Nevertheless, these two voters vigorously oppose retirement or impeachment, reflecting a consensus here. Those interviewed oppose retirement by a ratio of 2 to 1; by 35 to 27 with 8 undecided, they oppose even the start of impeachment proceedings.

A registered nurse an erstwhile Nixon voter who now opposes the President, opposes his removal because "I'm sure he wouldn't try to pull anything else now that everybody's got their eyes on him."

Moreover, these voters express overriding fear of impeachment. By 4 to 1, they believe impeachment—no matter how justified—would weaken the country. A middle-aged factory worker who voted for Sen. George McGovern in 1972 believes Mr. Nixon should finish his term "from the standpoint of the good of the country in the eyes of the world."

Finally, there is a cynical belief that removal of Mr. Nixon would be an act of futility. "Nobody is likely to do a better job anyway," says one McGovern voter, so Mr. Nixon might as well finish.

This cynicism also runs deep in reaction to the energy crisis. Nearly half do not think the crisis is serious, over a third confess they are doing little to conserve energy, and a 3 to 1 majority agrees the oil companies cooked up the crisis to increase profits. Mr. Nixon gets some blame, but the oil companies get much more.

The general climate of cynicism is typified by the 29-year-old wife of a factory worker who believes nothing that Mr. Nixon has said about the 18-minute buzz, suspecting instead he is personally responsible. But, she says, "nobody can do a good job these days" and Mr. Nixon, therefore, should finish his term. Politics is such a dirty business, she and her husband have decided, they will not vote in 1976 or in any future elections.

Futility, cynicism and skepticism are the barriers, then, that may protect Mr. Nixon against future revelations which, by nearly 4 to 1, these voters suspect lie undiscovered. If their present mood holds, however, even new disclosures will not make the impeachment case against the President.

NORMAN O. HOUSTON, SR.

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Whereas, The Los Angeles NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. is honoring Norman O. Houston, Sr., chairman of the board of Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Company and distinguished civic leader, for more than 50 years of service to the community, and;

Whereas, Norman Houston has built the largest Black Life Insurance Company in the Nation, but has still found time to devote

his energies and skill to his city and his State as a member of the Municipal Auditorium Commission and formerly to the State Athletic Commission, and;

Whereas, Norman Houston, a native Californian, is a life member of the NACCP, a vice-president and director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and a director of the Children's Home Society, the Recreation Youth Services Planning Council, the Crippled Children's Society, the American Cancer Society, the YMCA, 28th Street Branch; the International Student Center, and many others, therefore, be it

Known this 5th day of December 1973, that we are in recognition of Norman Houston's dedication and devotion to his fellow men and his remarkable record of public service and business ability and that this resolution be entered into the Congressional Record.

YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE,  
Member of Congress, 37th District, California.

PASS THE WATERGATE SOUP,  
PLEASE

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, although it would seem that every possible angle of the watergate has been explored and that the search for historical parallels has been exhaustive, I recently saw one further presentation of a situation which seems to be "on all fours" with the present crisis. The following appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of December 1973:

PASS THE WATERGATE SOUP, PLEASE

The Watergate tapes case seems to rocket along from one constitutional crisis to another. Just as everyone was bracing for a Supreme Court argument and decision, President Nixon snatched the case away. How will the issue be settled?

Reader W. M. Stapleton of Kansas City, Missouri, apparently a literary buff, writes that he has given careful attention to the many learned arguments on the executive privilege issue but has yet to see any reference to a similar controversy over the recipe for workhouse soup recounted by Charles Dickens in *Sketches by Boz*, published in 1836.

The incident Dickens writes of occurred during political jockeying for election to the office of parish beadle. Captain Purday, one of the candidates and a member of the parish visiting committee, "brought forward certain distinct and specific charges relative to the management of the workhouse," whose overseer also aspired to be beadle. As Dickens tells it:

"The captain boldly expressed his total want of confidence in the existing authorities, and moved for 'a copy of the recipe by which the paupers' soup was prepared, together with any documents relating thereto.'" This the overseer steadily resisted; he fortified himself by precedent, appealed to the established usage, and declined to produce the papers, on the ground of the injury that would be done to the public service, if documents of a strictly private nature, passing between the master of the workhouse and the cook, were to be thus dragged to light on the motion of any individual member of the vestry. The motion was lost by a majority of two; and then the captain, who never allows himself to be defeated, moved for a committee of inquiry into the whole

subject. The affair grew serious; the question was discussed at meeting after meeting, and vestry after vestry; speeches were made, attacks repudiated, personal defiances exchanged, explanations received, and the greatest excitement prevailed, until at last, just as the question was going to be finally decided, the vestry found that somehow or other, they had become entangled in a point of form, from which it was impossible to escape with propriety. So, the motion was dropped, and everybody looked extremely important, and seemed quite satisfied with the meritorious nature of the whole proceeding."

We are pleased to pass this precedent on to learned counsel for use in whatever manner they desire. Mr. Stapleton adds that he believes the soup recipe incident to be particularly instructive on the executive privilege issue, as the "denouement of the Watergate tapes controversy may, I suspect, be similar to the ultimate disposition of the soup affair."

FUEL SHORTAGE: A TEST OF INGENUITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the fuel shortage in which we now find this Nation and the threat of gas rationing have forced the American people to stop and more closely examine and value the energy which they consume every day. In order for this shortage to be alleviated, it will take the cooperation of all the American people.

My daily mail reveals a readiness of my constituents to bear their share of the sacrifices which they will be called upon to make. Many offer their own suggestions as to the best solutions to this problem. I have previously shared such information with you. Today I include for the consideration of my colleagues several other letters demonstrating the ingenuity of the American people:

FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH,  
Newport, Ark., December 1, 1973.

Hon. BILL ALEXANDER,  
Representative of Arkansas, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Surely because of all the expert help they have in the administration, somebody has thought of this. So what I say is probably to no avail. Yet, I like my novel idea and so pass it on to you, my U.S. Representative, so you may pass it on if you see fit.

As regards gas rationing, why coupons? Coupons create the black market. Why not credit cards? Each individual's number would be his Social Security number. The so-called credit cards would be the same size as regular auto gas credit cards and thus would fit in the little hand machines almost every gas station already has. Each card would have a rating that would be added to the number. For instance, my Social Security number is 450-60-0861. Let's say my rating would be "A," whatever that would mean. Thus, my number would be XXXXXXXXXXXX. The amount of gas each rating got could fluctuate through the years.

The forms (each gas station would have) could be computerized forms. If I "overspent" my ration I would be fined—and possibly fined heavily, according to law, with repeats suggesting a sentence. The gas station owner would not cheat because his copy

of the form he filled out would indicate the amount he sold me, and I would have my carbon copy of it. He could replace his gas when he turned over the form. He couldn't say he sold me more, through some black-mail deal with me, because that would indicate I bought more—and I wouldn't or couldn't allow that. (Forms, like checks, on which the figures were marked over would be voided and thus no good to replace that amount of gasoline.)

The gas station owner would turn over these forms to an office at the courthouse, or branch thereof, and receive a notarized paper authorizing the dealer to sell him X gallons of gasoline. And so on up the line.

To me it's a set-up—and ready-made. The credit-card machines are there. The courthouses are there. The Social Security numbers are there. The computers are there. People would take care of their credit cards because they have been doing it for years. Loss could be dealt with in much the same way that credit-card loss is today. A duplicate could be issued indicating "Duplicate 1" or "Duplicate 2," etc. The lost card could be tracked down and the word put out that it was lost or stolen. Replacement due to loss could warrant a reprimand at least, with the possibility that gas purchased by an unauthorized person would be credited against the loser.

I can see combinations of my idea of credit cards and the old idea of coupons. I can see various combinations of ideas. But I don't think gas rationing need be a nightmare. Nor do we need to price gas clear out of the poor man's market. Everyone can do his part—and minus the menace of a black market or rich versus poor.

Well, just thought this was worth telling someone about.

Sincerely,

NORMAN PROSE, Minister.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,  
December 3, 1973.

Congressman BILL ALEXANDER,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SR: Several ways to conserve fuel have been recommended but there are several important ways we can save fuels that have been overlooked. We are in an emergency, then why not apply emergency regulations at this critical period?

Why not require all shippers of heavy equipment, including new cars and trucks, to use the railroads? These are usually flat bed trucks and return to base empty, using fuel both ways—why?

Press reports indicate the railroads are in financial trouble and Congress is concerned with having to subsidize them (With taxpayers money). This type of freight can easily be handled by the rails and help them financially—keeping their present labor force and adding to their force by virtue of increased tonnage and income.

Also, require truck lines to make their longer trips with full loads each way. This may delay next morning service at times. Shippers should co-operate—a delay of two or three days is not critical with the kind of goods they have but fuel is critical. This does not include perishables.

Permit all children to go to the schools nearest their homes. This would save millions of gallons of fuel now consumed by busing children miles from their homes. This is a time of emergency, then why not apply emergency requirements to saving fuel?

The Postal Department is preparing to increase the rates, so why not economize on their operations? Why deliver mail on Saturday? I have asked many people if Saturday delivery is important to them and not one has said that it was, and if it was, Special Delivery could be used on Saturday as it is now used on Sunday. Many business and professional offices are closed on Saturday

and some have P.O. Boxes where they could get their mail. This would save much fuel and also labor costs. Present employment could be reduced as employees retire or leave the service by their own choice.

I am not a railroad man, neither do I own stock in any railroad nor do I have children in school. This is the first letter I have ever written to any Government officials or newspapers. I am withholding my name for obvious reasons as I do not want to be besieged with calls and letters.

JUST A CONCERNED CITIZEN.

POCAHONTAS, ARK.,

January 2, 1974.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: I am writing you on the concern of Energy Crisis mainly. Also on the Cache River Project which you are backing. I'm behind you in the way you think about dredging Cache River to drain the land for use in production of crops and food for our country. It seems to me that some people don't want the best things to be done to help our country. They are afraid it's going to hurt this or that.

I also saw you on the news cast a while back where you were making some comments on F.H.A. I really think it was about right that houses were not constructed the way they should be. Also that some of the officials were asleep and the poor people and working class are getting the jolt of their life out of it.

#### PETROLEUM ENERGY CRISIS COMMENT

With common horse sense, because I only have an eighth grade education.

I saw on the news tonight where they are reducing speed limit to 55 m.p.h. It is fine to do this if necessary, but it's a shame that we have paid such high taxes to build good interstate highways and have to drive slow. Also they are cutting back flights on airlines and factory production on account of fuel shortage. This means that we are going to have a lot of American people laid off their jobs. Now no jobs. This means our government and States have to pay unemployment compensation. So the pot just keeps boiling, and what next!

My theory of a Solution:

(1) I think that the government should see if it can't get carburetor companies to build carburetors to get twice the mileage on cars and put them on the market for people to buy, if they wish, to put on their vehicles and get rid of pollution control systems, because they make cars burn more fuel. I have talked to friends that have late model cars and trucks that are only getting 8 to 10 miles per gallon. Mine are not that bad, but it could be better.

(2) I think that car manufacturers should build all new cars and pickup trucks to get better mileage.

If a car or truck using a gallon of gas goes 8 miles now, was perfected to get 16 miles per gallon by changing carburetors and taking off pollution control systems adds up to this:

- (1) 50% more fuel for America.
- (2) 50% less pollution, because you are only burning 1 gallon of gas instead of 2 gallons going the same distance.
- (3) Gives the American people more for their money.
- (4) Better mileage means more fuel to keep America rolling. Which means keeping American companies producing, such as Carburetor factories, car manufacturers, and all other industries. If we can keep America producing, we can keep American people out of unemployment compensation lines and keep American taxes from rising.

Also they talk on the news about electricity shortage.

I believe we have enough rivers in the U.S.

to produce all the electricity we could ever use by building power plants along the rivers and turning generators by enormous water wheels.

I think that some of the American people are trying to get some fat pocket books or it seems that way. And it sure isn't helping the little pocket books. A fat pocket book won't do the one that has it any good, if he wakes up some morning and nothing to buy because of fuel shortage and no production from our farms and factories. So I think it's time that our officials that are asleep in Federal Government and State Government should wake up and start thinking straight and help those that are thinking. Also the same for personnel over our refineries, factories and farms. I know that these people are far more intelligent than I am (So for God's Sake) May they help America and all the American people.

Mr. Alexander, I appreciate you taking time to read this and if you can use it any way use it if it makes sense to you. You are on the Ball in my books. Keep up the good work. God Bless you and your family.

Let's keep America Rolling, And Ole Glory Waving and may it always be free for Americans and their children.

Sincerely yours,

LOREN ANIS.

P.S.—Write me a card or letter if you can.

#### DUTIES AND HAZARDS OF THE FEDERAL FIREFIGHTER

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, a constituent of mine, Mr. Jerry Ellis, brought to my attention an article on the Federal firefighter. Mr. Ellis is himself a civilian Federal firefighter and is, of course, well aware of the dangers inherent in his job. I am inserting the following article to inform my colleagues of the duties and hazards of the Federal firefighter:

THREE LINE-OF-DUTY DEATHS PROVE INHERENT DANGERS OF FEDERAL FIREFIGHTERS' JOB  
Federal fire fighters—what are they? You can't tell me that a Federal fire fighter's job is as dangerous as city fire fighters! Federal fire fighters work in a controlled atmosphere; therefore, what's all this worry about special legislation for this small group of Federal employees?

Tell that to the families of three Federal fire fighters who died violent deaths in the line of duty in recent weeks. Brian Lindsey and Stanley Hertel, both members of Local F-23, Naval Station, San Diego, were killed in the line of duty on October 23 when a JP-4 tank trailer exploded. Stephen Shiffer died while fighting a fire in the hold of a Navy barge at San Clemente Island, Calif. Both accidents are now under investigation.

Yet, whenever you try to improve the working conditions of Federal fire fighters, you get the same old "ho-hum," "why bother" attitude from management. But we do not intend to forego our responsibilities.

The IAFF knows fire on a government base is just as HOT as a fire in any city. Our critics say we work in a controlled environment. Little does this matter, even if it were true, when most federal fire departments are undermanned to a level that borders on tak-

ing "calculated" out of the phrase "calculated risk" and substituting the word "suicide". Some say it is "controlled" because there is some degree of enforcement for correcting fire inspection hazards. But what does this matter when vast numbers of government installations have buildings and other structures that are pre-World War II, wood-framed fire traps. Other buildings house Research and Development projects that could make all conventional fire fighter techniques ineffective. This is not to mention the fact that Federal fire fighters are required to physically stand by at all hazardous operations, such as fueling or defueling missiles, tankers, aircraft and the like; standing by while various exotic and unstable fuels and oxidizers are tested, and other hazardous operations.

The point is that Federal fire fighters perform the hazardous standbys so often that the average government manager considers these standbys routine. Well, this International knows this is a mistake of the most horrendous proportion, as tragically proven twice in California. We know that the Federal fire fighter "puts it on the line" every day, even though he may not physically fight a fire that day.

It is our hope this article will stir action by Congress on legislation already before it that will deal with some of the Federal fire fighters' conditions. We especially call attention to HR-9281 which will improve the retirement method so these faithful and dedicated employees can enjoy some of the fruits of their labors, and HR-8028 and S-1953 which will reduce the archaic 72 hour work-week for Federal fire fighters to 56 hours per week. Finally, we call for the speedy passage of S-1769 which will give this nation a National Fire Prevention and Control Act which will deal properly with the fire-related problems of every fire fighter and citizen in America.

#### JUST FOR THE RECORD

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, much controversy has arisen over President Nixon's tax writeoff on his official papers, and his assertion that the late President Lyndon Johnson gave him the idea. I think my colleagues will be interested in this editorial from the Houston Post, regarding President Johnson's papers:

#### JUST FOR THE RECORD

In view of President Nixon's reference to the late President Lyndon Johnson as having given him the idea for taking a tax write-off on official papers, it is interesting to notice President Johnson's own record. LBJ is thought to have taken a tax deduction for \$200,000 out of a total of 31 million papers. They dealt with his life up to the time he entered the Senate.

Ralph Newman, chairman of the Chicago Public Library, who has worked for every president since Herbert Hoover, appraised the LBJ papers, as he later did the Nixon papers. He set a value of \$20 million to \$40 million on the LBJ papers.

But President Johnson bequeathed all the papers of his Senate years, his vice presidency and his presidency to the LBJ Library without asking any tax advantage for his estate.

## TWO EDITORIALS

## HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there were several editorials and columns that were published during our break in the congressional session that I believe are of special interest.

For anyone who wonders about the objectivity missing in our press, especially from individual columnists. I insert without any further comments on my part, two columns that appeared in the Chicago Tribune's Monday, December 24, Perspective page by the Trib's own Bob Wiedrich and nationally syndicated columnist, Nicholas von Hoffman. These two columnists coincidentally discuss the same subject. I will leave it up to the reader as to which treated it more objectively. The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 24, 1973]

LET PRESIDENT GET AWAY FROM OFFICE  
(By Bob Wiedrich)

This is one taxpayer who thinks Richard M. Nixon is entitled to spend the holidays with his family in Florida or any place else he wants to go—the energy crisis notwithstanding.

The man needs a rest.

Lord knows, the job is demanding enough without being denied the simple pleasure of getting away for a while from the prisoner status the Presidency has imposed on each of its occupants since George Washington had the job.

Like it or not, the President is a special case. The pressures of his post are great, the strain incalculable. And even if some of the tensions result from the Watergate bumbblings of his own staff, Nixon is still the chief executive of this nation, responsible for running its affairs.

So if we don't want an exhausted basket case making domestic and international decisions affecting all our lives in a time of incredible stress, then the critics of Nixon's personal travel plans should get off his back and recognize the unique demands of the Presidency on a human being.

In the first place, let's be honest with ourselves.

Darned few average Joe citizens are likely to observe in the next few days the voluntary 10-gallon-a-week gasoline ration plan suggested last week by energy chief William E. Simon.

Most made their vacation plans some time ago and probably will go bipping off across the fields and thru the woods to grandmother's house—or catch hell from the family for not doing so.

Therefore, why not give the President a break, too?

Granted, as the country's leader, he should set an example. He has been doing so. He's reduced the number of weekend trips to Camp David, Md. He's slowed down his jet to conserve fuel.

But a couple of weeks ago, when he thought it would be a good idea to symbolically take the train to Key Biscayne, Nixon caught all kinds of published and broadcast hell. And the other night, when he drove over to daughter Julie Eisenhower's home in nearby Bethesda, Mr., for dinner, a reporter started inquiring how much gas the Presidential motorcade burned going those few miles.

In his own words, the President feels he is damned if he does and damned if he doesn't.

The thought of coupling onto a regular Florida-bound train the few cars required to haul the White House party down South was aimed at demonstrating Nixon is willing to make sacrifices to save energy, just as he has asked the American people to do.

However, again because of the unique circumstances of his job, Nixon was thwarted. The President, you see, can't just flop into a coach seat or Pullman berth like the average plain Joe. He needs extra cars for the Secret Service and the multitude of aides and electronic communications equipment essential to running the nation wherever he goes. He can't be out of touch.

Thus, the additional railroad facilities would have overloaded the already jammed Amtrak holiday train. A special Presidential train would have been required. The idea bombed out and Nixon was accused of grandstanding.

Realistically, the President of the United States can't fly via commercial airliner for the very same reasons. He can't hop into the family Volkswagen to visit his daughter.

But, at the same time, Nixon should not be forced to become a prisoner of the White House, paying a penalty unique only to his office, just because of the fear of criticism.

He lives, eats, breathes, sleeps, and labors there like a dog in the pursuit of his duties. He is our President. He is entitled to a respite, whether you agree with him politically or not. He is also entitled to a family life and some peace of mind.

Personally, we hope he boards a panel or train or pogo stick and goes to Florida for the holidays. We only wish the President a Merry Christmas and a much happier New Year.

## LIVING IT UP IN AN IMPERIAL STYLE

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

WASHINGTON.—All comparisons of Richard Nixon with other Presidents are invidious, but people insist on making them. It is pointed out that while Thomas Jefferson went \$20,000 in debt occupying the office that Nixon now honors, Nixon has spent his time in the White House becoming a millionaire. Others remark that while George Washington never told a lie, Nixon never told the truth.

A more immediately instructive comparison might be drawn, however, between our Presidential tax loopholer's manner of living off the public purse and Ralph Nader, a man who a small minority of us would like to see in Nixon's job. The exchange would be like putting a tourniquet on the United States Treasury.

Fortune Magazine [see "The Imperial Life Style of the U.S. President," by Dan Cordtz, in the October issue] says that the White House staff under Nixon probably has tripled since the Johnson years. The adverb "probably" must be used since the actual White House budget is a more closely kept secret than the details of such national security items as the milk deal.

If it came from an antiadministration source I wouldn't believe it, but Fortune says, "One aide walks beside the President to tell him in advance whether to turn left or right at a corner or warn of the number of steps in a staircase. The ranks of such courtiers have increased at an unprecedented rate during the Nixon administration."

The magazine has counted 75 maids, butlers, cooks, and caretakers attending Nixon in addition to five Boeing 707s [up two from Johnson], 16 specially soundproofed helicopters, and a fleet of 11 Lockheed Jetstars needed to transport him and the rest of the czar's entourage around.

"Ladybird Johnson rode the Eastern Airlines shuttle on shopping trips to New York," Fortune informs us, "but the Nixon family, including his daughters and sons-in-law, habitually travel by government plane."

Compare this to Nader, who lives in an \$80-a-month furnished room and has no

servants, no cars, and no airplane. His gross annual living expenses are about \$5,000 a year, or roughly what it costs the public to support Nixon for a morning—a morning, no doubt, devoted to working out some new, perfectly legal, sleazy deal.

Nader operates out of a small pedestrian office. Nixon has no fewer than nine different offices, including one set up at his friend Robert Abplanalp's house, and two each at San Clemente and Camp David. Why a man needs two private offices in the same place has yet to be explained by Gen. Alexander Haig & Haig, the President's personal conjurer of malevolent spirits.

Speaking of Camp David, Fortune, which has grown accustomed to the luxurious life of the world's most powerful executives, reports in tones almost shocked that "since Nixon became President, several of the lodges [at Camp David] have been rebuilt and others redecorated. A heated free-form swimming pool has been installed to go with the existing bowling alley, archery and skeet ranges, pool table, tennis courts, pitch-and-putt golf green and nature trails."

All of this is government-owned and maintained at public expense, and you would like to think it would be enough, but he has to have four houses, counting San Clemente, which even Fortune says was bought thru a "sweetheart loan."

No wonder he has no time to run the country. Just getting to and using all those facilities must be an all-consuming operation. Nader, on the other hand, puts in an 18- to 20-hour day, or a 126-hour working week, which means if we elected him President he'd be too busy to collect houses. Anyway, he's too stingy.

Thomas Whiteside, in a New Yorker magazine profile says, "To save stamps and stationery Nader states in his ads that the money sent in by contributors won't be acknowledged." If only Nixon had confined himself to written thank-yous with his illegal oil contributors.

Moving about with a manila folder and nobody to tell him when to turn right or left, Nader is given at least partial credit for a list of legislation that goes far beyond automobiles, among which are the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act, the Radiation Control Act, the Wholesome Meat Act, the Wholesome Poultry Products Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, and on and on, and all down without the service of a single butler. Nader has probably saved more lives than Nixon-Kissinger have rubbed out.

It is crazy. People say that America is too old and too crooked to take an honest President, but a Nader inauguration would be a gas. Can't you see him, after getting himself inaugurated, going over to the rooming house and packing his other suit in his beat-up bag, and then walking over to the White House and telling the guard at the gate that Nixon's fanfare blowers can go home because he's just signed the lease?

## A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL "STONEWALL" JACKSON ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF HIS 150TH BIRTHDAY

## HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom the privilege of the people of a State to revel in the glory of their ancestors. But today, January 21, the citizens of West Virginia, along with the rest of the Nation, will pay homage to an il-

lustrious and great American. It was on this day in 1824 that Thomas Jonathan Jackson entered this world. It is only fitting that all Americans be aware of the dedication and greatness which characterize the distinguished Confederate general, Stonewall Jackson. It matters not that he wore blue or grey, but that he fought bravely and gallantly for that in which he believed.

Born and reared in Clarksburg, W. Va., Thomas Jackson grew up in a society which was based on friends, hard work, and a faith in God. Instilled with the pride and determination which characterized the people of the Upper Monongahela country, he was undaunted by early hardships. Raised in near poverty, his mother and father died during his early childhood. In school, he worked diligently to compensate for a late beginning. He impressed his superiors and soon received a recommendation to West Point. Graduating 17th in his class, the able Jackson soon found himself in the Mexican War. His qualities of genius and his boundless enthusiasm were proven and distinguished several times and he became a major only 18 months after graduation.

His career as a professor at the Virginia Military Institute was cut short when the Nation found itself tragically at war from within, and Jackson was to prove a hero who could not fail. His distinguished and noble career is marked by some of the greatest military accomplishments ever known. At the Battle of Bull Run, Brig. Gen. Barnard E. Bee was justly impressed with Jackson's wall-like stance against the enemy in the face of great odds and spoke of Jackson as a "stone wall." This sobriquet was to stay with Jackson the rest of his life. Many critics consider Jackson's tactics in the famous valley campaign of 1862 the most remarkable display of strategy based on accurate reasoning and judgment in all of American military history.

Confederate military leader Gen. Robert E. Lee considered Jackson to be his most trusted, able, and indispensable leader. Aggressive and bold, he was also blessed with a calm demeanor which gave him a perspective into sound tactical planning and execution. As a result, almost every critic places him among the top six greatest military generals the world has ever known.

Yet, it would not do this great man justice to simply exalt him on his military exploits. For it is Stonewall Jackson, the person, of whom all Americans can be justly proud. The simplicity which enriched his domestic and religious life is a guide for people everywhere. A deacon and Sunday school teacher, Jackson was an extremely devout person. A faith in God permeated his every action. While a great general, he personally detested the cruelties of war. Yet, he knew what he must do and he held an unrelenting faith throughout the war that greatness would soon come to this country.

Whether teaching pupils in a classroom, planning military strategy at night in his tent, or leading his men in

battle over the war-stained valleys of the South, his faith in God accompanied him. His men revered him and were affected with an almost religious fervor when he was among them. After many weary and sleepless days and nights, his troops could be rejuvenated by a simple gesture of his arm and they would shout in jubilation and trudge forward. His favorite topic of conversation was theology, and he juxtaposed his own maxims on life into saying with religious connotation. His belief that "you may be whatever you resolve to be" was more than just a way of life for him. It was life itself.

One can easily understand the love and admiration Jackson's soldiers held for him. The affectionately referred to him as "Old Jack." While many generals and leaders have remained aloof and distant from their men, Jackson felt himself to be one of them. He was often seen mingling among his men, perched atop his horse "Little Sorrell," donned in a stained dingy tunic. His infantry was widely known for its remarkable speed and efficiency, which is a great tribute to Stonewall Jackson. Soon his troops were called "foot cavalry" and became renowned world-wide for their determination. The General instilled in them a love and desire to fight for what was dear to them. Regardless of the cause, the fact that Jackson was able to lead and guide his with such knowledge and determination marks him a true leader of men.

Jackson's close friends knew him to be sincere and kind. He held truth and honesty in the highest esteem and would not associate with those who lacked such virtues. A sensible and pleasant companion, he was always kind to those in need. His words were few and simple but also clear, direct, and all encompassing. He listened respectfully and patiently to others. Though he was modest, once a judgment was made his reliance on it became absolute. His soldiers knew that beneath his general's uniform and official exterior there lay a heart burdened with compassion and concern for their welfare and safety.

A union of soldier and saint, General Jackson—Stonewall, Professor Jackson, or Old Jack—was loved and admired by friend and foe. He won his nickname at Manassas and immortality in the Shenandoah Valley. He met his tragic fate in the blur of night when he was inadvertently felled by a Confederate rifle.

He died on May 10 of 1863, but not before trying desperately to regain health to once again lead his men into the dawn of battle. Before he died, he murmured with all the assuredness of the position he held: "Let us pass over the river and rest under the shade of the tree." And thus he has passed over the river and into the hearts and admiration of people throughout the world.

He was sorely missed by his commanding officer, General Lee, who said of Jackson: "Such an executive officer the sun never shone on."

Thus it can be readily seen why West Virginians are justly proud of their native son on the anniversary of his 150th birthday.

## A TRIBUTE TO JOHN BRODIE

### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, last month, after 17 years as quarterback with the San Francisco 49ers football team, John Brodie retired.

Now, John Brodie has begun another career, dedicating himself to helping others through Narconom programs which guide persons in drug, alcohol and criminal rehabilitation.

I have long admired John Brodie. We graduated together from Oakland Tech High School, and I have followed his gridiron exploits—first at Stanford where he won All-American plaudits and then with the 49ers, the first professional football team in northern California.

But just as John Brodie will long be remembered by fans as one of the finest and most graceful athletes in any sport, I today pay tribute to John Brodie, the humanitarian.

I wish John all the best in this new challenge, and I would only hope that his efforts to help humanity will serve as an example for all of us.

At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article by Bob Oates of the Los Angeles Times concerning John Brodie:

JOHN BRODIE: PASSER TO PREACHER

(By Bob Oates)

The John Brodie career is winding down. It has been a big one—long, distinguished, historic. No other football player ever spent 17 consecutive seasons with the team that drafted him. And in another month it will all be over. Brodie has announced his retirement as of the end of this season.

At 38 he is about to move from the pocket to the pulpit. The veteran San Francisco quarterback has determined to spend next year in graduate work in Scientology—and the degree at the end of that road is D.D. (doctor of divinity).

Brodie has no desire to preach to the world. He just wants to help. The action arm of the Church of Scientology is Narconom; and these and football are now Brodie's three interests.

Narconom is a non-profit agency specializing in drug, alcohol and criminal rehabilitation. Individual pastoral counseling is the means of approach. And according to Brodie, the focus is on the individual confusions and problems that lead to abuses in the use of stimulants.

"I know I could play several more years of football," says the 49er star, whose fast release as a passer has protected him from the physical beatings that have shortened the careers of most quarterbacks. "But everybody's life is a matter of priorities, and for the next year or so, starting right after the season, mine are Scientology and Narconom. I want the advanced training I need to be effective in this field. In 1974 I won't have time for football, but I will after that. I would like to keep a football connection indefinitely along with these other two things."

The National Football League is financing his 1974 scholarship at the school of Scientology—in a manner of speaking. Upon retirement from the 49ers Brodie will begin

collecting on the financial settlement he made in 1968 when the NFL dissuaded him from jumping to an AFL team.

This has been estimated at nearly \$1 million. In addition, it has been estimated that Brodie's San Francisco salary all these years has aggregated about another million.

If he is the first \$1 million player in football history, confirmation is lacking. He and the club deny it. The 49ers want to pay him more. They want him back next year, although they are reconciled to his decision.

Brodie's departure ends the 49ers' greatest era. He led them to their only three divisional titles in 1970-71-72 before giving way to younger quarterbacks this season in a move the club frankly labels "experimental" based on the prospect of a future without Brodie.

His San Francisco records may never be equaled. One of the most accurate passers football has developed, the former Stanford quarterback has completed 55% of 4,000-plus NFL passes for more than 30,000 yards and 200 touchdowns.

He has done it with a flair identifying him as perhaps the league's most graceful athlete. Brodie is easy-going, unassertive, but affable if you know him. If you don't you couldn't pick him out of the convention crowd in a hotel lobby. He has a slightly receding hairline but with longer hair he could be a 20-year-old golf pro—a career he once considered. He has played in the U.S. Open.

"For me," he says, "golf is out for a while. I'll have less time for it next year than I've had playing football. I don't like anything to interfere with what I give first priority."

*Is there any chance for a change of priorities: one more season as a quarterback?*

"I think everybody who knows me well knows there isn't," says Brodie, who will be playing in the Coliseum Sunday for the last time. "I wouldn't have announced my retirement if I hadn't meant it. I'm very much looking forward to my year of advanced courses in Scientology."

*What led to your interest in this particular subject?*

"It began several years ago when my arm was bothering me and I couldn't throw the football. In Scientology, the starting point is often medical consultation—with treatment by MDs—and the medication helped me for a while. But the body builds up a tolerance for medication and my arm didn't stay well. I moved on to the routine of spiritual consultation and my arm got better in a hurry and stayed that way. If it could do that for my arm, I began to realize what it could do for the rest of me."

*As a practical matter, what do you plan to be doing in the Narconom program?*

"I'd like to work with all ages in the schools and other places—person efficiency classes, things like that."

*Doing what?*

"Well, broadly speaking, the object of Scientology is to help an individual regain the abilities he hasn't been using. It concentrates on source things—the confusions and problems that interfere with life as you'd like to live it. Narconom is similar with respect to drug abuse. It attacks the confusions that make a guy want to leave reality. He wouldn't want to leave if he didn't have these problems. Narconom doesn't get into technologies. The idea is to help the guy clear up the confusions that keep him from enjoying reality."

*What other NFL players have indicated an interest in the Scientology drug program?*

"There are several who have been in contact with it, but I think they should speak for themselves."

*Does football have a drug problem?*

"Same answer. I don't think it's my business to discuss things like that. My interest is what I am personally going to do."

*And on that subject, you think you can combine careers in Scientology and football?*

"Yes, football has given me everything I have in a material way. I love it. I'm a football addict."

*After your playing career is over, what aspect of the game do you want to get into?*

"You know what the options are. I'm not excluding anything. I couldn't coach next year, but that's the only exclusion."

*Is it a different game than it was when you started 17 years ago?*

*From your point of view, does pro football seem to be a game with several well-defined eras?*

"Not really. It's different than it was in the 1950s but it's not a lot more complicated. The defenses, of course, are more effective. They do more things now, but you would expect that. They're not really more complicated. The big difference—the real difference—is in the players. They're a hell of a lot better than they were in the 50s."

*So how do you keep up with them now?*

"I'm better now, too. I had to improve to survive."

*Apparently you disagree with those who say the NFL has become a defensive league.*

"This has always been a game of defense. Look who's won the championships over the years. I haven't been aware of a defensive trend—but I'm sure aware there are better players now. I don't mean they've improved gradually like everything else in the world. They are almost a new breed of player."

*What accounts for this?*

"I'm sure it's related first of all to the pay structure. Sure, it's a game and it's fun and all that, but the income is so good you want to stay in football and keep making money year after year. So you take care of yourself the year round. This makes you last longer, and with more experience every season you get pretty good. This is a league with a lot of 10-year men now. When I came in, there weren't many. That's the kind of difference I've noticed in my time in football."

*In your time, who is the best quarterback you've seen?*

"I don't like to make judgments of that kind. I've been around five or six standout quarterbacks: Bart Starr, Y.A. Tittle, Sonny Jurgenson, Joe Namath, Roman Gabriel, when he had those two or three super years in Los Angeles; Fran Tarkenton has to be considered; so does John Hadl."

*What do you look for in a great quarterback?*

"Consistency over a period of time. The question is, who played the longest? The only other question is, how do they play for him? A great quarterback is one who makes his group work, makes them go. The only thing that counts is effectiveness."

*Is there one best style for a quarterback?*

"The great ones have all had their own style. If you're a young quarterback, I'd say that unless you develop a personal style, you may never be a great quarterback."

*Of the teams you've seen or played on in the last 17 years, do you have one you'd take against any other?*

"My most memorable year was 1965—and the 49ers that year were the best team I've seen. The backs were John David Crow and Ken Willard. John David is the best back I've played with. The receivers were Bernie Casey, Dave Parks and Monte Stickles. As a group there has been none better. Casey had a ton of talent. John Thomas, one of our guards that year, is the best I've seen. In fact, all five members of the offensive line that year played in the Pro Bowl."

*As I recall, 1965 wasn't a good year in San Francisco. That was five years before your first title.*

"We were barely over .500 in 1965, 7-6-1 I think. We scored 28 points or more in three

different games that year and lost all three."

*Who was the coach?*

"Jack Christiansen, but I'm not casting aspersions on anybody. It happens that way in football sometimes."

*The Brodie era has roughly spanned the era of John Unitas, who is also retiring this year—along with Dick Butkus, maybe, and several others. It's a coincidence that so many should be departing at this time. What do you remember from your first year?*

"I also came in with some good names. In 1957, in fact, I was drafted ahead of Jim Brown—but after Jon Arnett. The class of 1957 might have been the best rookie class the NFL has had."

*Who else came up with you that year?*

"Del Shofner, Tommy McDonald, Jack Pardee, Abe Woodson. There were five quarterbacks: Paul Hornung, Len Dawson, Sonny Jurgenson, Milt Plum and myself. Jim Parker, considered the all-time guard. Don Shinglin, Jerry Tubbs, Terry Barr, Don Boessler, Billy Ray Barnes, Clarence Peaks—and quite a few others."

*Do you think you'll outlast Jurgenson?*

"It depends. If he retires this month, yes."

## AGRICULTURE, RESEARCH, AND SHORTAGE OF FUNDS AND FOOD

### HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial in *Science*, a periodical published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Emanuel Epstein, professor of plant nutrition at the University of California at Davis, sounds a warning we all should heed. He cautions that American agriculture is in the grips of a drought threatening its very roots, which, if left unchecked, could stunt our agricultural growth for years to come and seriously threaten our ability to maintain prosperity at home and to meet mankind's ever growing needs for food and fibre.

Professor Epstein is not referring to a calamity of mother nature, but of human nature—to an evaporation of interest in agricultural advancement which is drying up funds in all fields of agricultural research.

Mr. Speaker, while the United States may be known first and foremost as an industrial country, we are, as well, the greatest agricultural nation the world has ever seen. We produce greater quantities of more kinds of crops at less cost than any other country ever. Our unparalleled agricultural productivity has been the main stem of our health and happiness at home as well as a life sustaining branch for literally hundreds of millions of people world-wide. This has not been the haphazard product of weed-like growth but rather the harvest of systematic and sustained research in all aspects of agriculture.

The energy fiasco should have taught us the high cost we pay when we neglect research out of complacency. Though we may have had reason 5 years or so ago to believe the green revolution would soon be won, the last 2 years should have made clear to us all that this particular millennium is still not near at hand.

Shortages and spiraling prices at home, malnourishment and famine abroad abide despite the real advances that have been made. The future no longer holds the happy prospect of a world of plenty. We now know that today's tools and technology cannot do the job. This knowledge leads to the compelling conclusion, as Professor Epstein points out, that only by continuing to nourish the deep roots of agricultural research can we maintain a pace of growth adequate to the demands of the future.

Congress has a vital role to play in seeing that we sow well enough today to reap an adequate harvest tomorrow. I commend Professor Epstein's editorial to all of my colleagues.

The article follows:

**AGRICULTURE, RESEARCH, AND SHORTAGES OF FUNDS AND FOOD**

Agricultural research in this country is being starved at the very time that rising prices and tight supplies of food both at home and abroad demand that it be given major support as one of the nation's top tasks.

America's ability to produce an abundance of food represents this country's greatest potential for doing good in the world and for making its influence felt in the world. During World War II, America greatly contributed to the breadbasket of our allies, and after that war American food helped to sustain the populations and rebuild the economies of a score of countries, those of wartime friends and foes alike. That crisis over, American agricultural know-how, machines, seeds, and fertilizers energized and modernized agricultural economies in many parts of the world and lifted regions previously fettered by ineffectual traditional methods to unheard-of levels of performance in farming and food production. At home, America's agriculture has provided for our citizens ample food of a staggering variety, for a far smaller percentage of the average take-home pay than is the rule almost anywhere in the world.

Agricultural research of a scope and variety unparalleled anywhere, any time, has been the wellspring from which this bounty has flowed. That research, begun in an empirical fashion in the early days of the Republic, grew later into a broad, sophisticated enterprise extending from the field to the laboratory, from the packing shed to the pilot plant, from the feedlot to the experimental kitchen. Such was the success of this research and the agriculture to which it gave rise that "food surpluses" became an issue for politicians appealing to a predominantly urban population complacently accustomed to supermarket shelves well stocked with food at reasonable prices.

The euphoria of rising agricultural production, worldwide, and of cheap food at home is over. Drought on four continents and other factors have curtailed food supplies and raised the specter of starvation. Massive shipments of wheat and other foods have done away with the safeguard of full granaries in the United States. The Department of Agriculture has discontinued its monthly list of plentiful foods because there aren't enough items to qualify, with supplies tight and prices high and climbing.

This is not the place for an analysis of the many factors that have conspired to bring this situation about. But one thing is certain: if the attrition now afflicting agricultural research in this country is not reversed, the prospect of improvement of the current situation will recede ever farther into the future. Throughout the country, budgets for agricultural research, especially research aimed at production, are stationary or

shrinking. Funds earmarked for production research are cut at a time of much concern for urban and ghetto problems, as if getting enough cheap food were not important to the people who live there. Positions at land grant colleges and agricultural experiment stations which used to be staffed the year around are being cut to 9 months, as though, like students, crops and livestock took summer vacations. Grant support, always hard to come by for agricultural research, is getting even more scarce.

Food, in adequate quantity and at moderate cost, is the most keenly felt need of the people everywhere. We, as a nation, must resolve to put first things first. Food is first. We must reemphasize and revitalize agricultural research. No single other investment can do more to earn for this country goodwill abroad, and at home, to restore to Americans their traditional confidence in having a reliable supply of ample, cheap food.

**PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE**

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the House adjourned last month, the Select Committee on Committees produced a draft report and resolution resulting from its consideration of various proposals for reform of procedures of the House. I have read this report carefully, and have concluded that it creates a number of problems which appear to have been given little or no consideration by the select committee. The evils which this proposal would visit upon the House appear to more than outweigh the advantages which it seems to promise.

These problems must be examined carefully before the House is rushed prematurely into action which will later turn out to have been ill-advised. Accordingly, I ask that there be reprinted in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the chairman of the select committee which outlines a few of the objections to the proposal which seem to be most appropriate to the concerns of the Members in general. I believe that an objective analysis of these proposals will indicate that they should be rejected by this body, promptly, so that we can return to consideration of the more important matters which confront us this year.

The letter follows:

HON. RICHARD BOLLING,  
Chairman, Select Committee on Committees,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The recent draft report and resolution proposed by your Committee appears to create a number of problems which appear either not to have been considered at all, or only superficially. I believe that these must be discussed openly and at length before final recommendations are made by your Committee and action is scheduled by the House.

My principal objections are to two aspects of these proposals: one, the elimination of several existing Committees of the House,

and two, the decision to limit members to only one major Committee.

There may indeed be reasons for disbanding one or more of the standing Committees of the House—but if those reasons exist, they were never stated by your Committee. I believe that there are significant arguments in favor of retaining some or all of these, and that the pros and cons of your decision should have been clearly stated. As the report stands, it appears that an arbitrary decision has been reached on this point. It is certainly true that some of the Committees which you propose to disband have been considered as "minor" in the past—it is just as true that you also propose to retain some of these "minor" Committees. Never is the basis stated for retaining or disbanding any Committee.

As a practical matter, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which you propose to shut down, has been responsible for a large number of bills in the past several years. Testimony before your Committee showed that the number of that Committee's bills which passed the House in the last Congress exceeded the number produced by all but two Committees of the House during the same period, and that many of these bills had major policy implications. In the last three Congresses, my own Subcommittee has produced at least three: the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, and the Endangered Species Act. In terms of conservation and environmental legislation, this Committee has major responsibilities, and I believe that the record will show that we have acted effectively and responsibly.

The same objection can be made to the failure of the Committee to explain its reasons for concluding that no Member should be permitted to serve on more than one of the 15 primary Committees proposed in your reorganization plan. This appears to be one of the basic premises upon which your entire proposal is founded, and yet no discussion of the merits or disadvantages of the concept is provided in the Report. The only hint of justification is found in a brief discussion of the need to "greatly reduce" the problem of Committee meeting conflicts.

It is undeniable that conflicts exist, and that this can be and often is inconvenient to busy Members. At the same time, as we all know, it is possible to perform adequately and responsibly in the face of these conflicts.

If a means can be found to reduce these conflicts without creating other and more serious problems, then such means should be explored and examined. The draft Report makes no attempt to do this.

Certainly there are substantial arguments against the "one Member, one Committee" proposal. Principal among these is the fact—not the theory, but the fact—that in so doing, you minimize and perhaps even destroy the ability of members on other Committees which have conflicting or overlapping jurisdictions to play any role in the shaping of legislation before it has been reported to the House. This in turn means a large increase in substantial amendments, controversy and fights on the Floor of the House.

At the same time, this concept condemns those members who may not agree with legislation under consideration to a lack of information about the merits of those bills. Further, and in the same step, you make it far easier for special interest groups to concentrate their energies upon Committee members, and thus to hamper or neutralize opposition to measures which they favor. Lobbies will be enabled to engage in their activities in the comfortable and certain knowledge that theirs will be the only voices which will be heard.

The House has been productive and creative in bringing forward new legislation, where this has been possible, as a direct by-product of the wholesome diversity of expertise, jurisdiction and skills to be found in Members, Committees and Committee staffs who have been enriched by the breadth and sweep of Committee responsibilities. Another highly beneficial result of this has been the useful competition between Committees and their memberships to serve the public in new and innovative ways with respect to legislation and legislative oversight. Diversity of Committee memberships and assignments has added significantly to the breadth of view and experience of members. Time after time, this has added significant additional capability to the House as a whole.

It is perhaps an unfortunate fact of life that it may not be possible for a member to serve legitimate needs of his constituents and of his nation through service in only one Committee. A ready example of the cost of this concept might be the example of our late and beloved colleague Tom Pelly. Serving conscientiously as a member of both the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Science and Astronautics Committee, he represented his constituents extremely well in both regards. Had he been forced to choose between the two Committees, I believe that the Committee which he was forced to leave would have been seriously penalized. Certainly as ranking minority member of our Committee, he played a major role in shaping fisheries and conservation legislation, and I am told that he was also a highly valued member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics as well.

To deny such members the opportunity to participate in the activities of both Committees, to the extent that they may be willing to accept such burdens, is to deny their abilities both to the Congress and to the nation.

If this has to be done—if the merits of this proposition so outweigh the obvious disadvantages—then so be it. But the Committee will be derelict in its obligations to the House if, as it has done here, it attempts to sell the proposition with no discussion of the points for and against it.

Nor does the proposed report deal with the inevitable costs of taking up this proposal at this time. The Congress is now the focal point, in a way unmatched in the past century, of a struggle between the executive and legislative branches of government, in which it is attempting to regain its position as an equal and not a subordinate. It faces a very real prospect of months of bitter and perhaps partisan struggle concerning the possible impeachment of the President. And all of this is taking place in an election year, with its pressures of finishing our legislative schedule in a timely and responsible fashion.

None of these defects would be an absolute barrier to the full consideration of the need for legislative reorganization, if that need is clearly shown, and if it is demonstrated that the proposed plan has been carefully and dispassionately considered. Reading the proposed report of the Committee, however, I can only conclude that many of the premises upon which it is based appear to have been arbitrarily selected, for reasons which were never stated. While I agree that the House must improve its internal procedures, I do not find anywhere in the documents furnished to the membership a justification for the total revision and perversion of the Committee system which appear to be its principal focus.

As a brief for your proposal, I find your draft report to be inconclusive, obscure and wholly unpersuasive. I am, in fact, persuaded that the kindest thing that we can do is to vote it down quickly, and to resume consideration of the needs and mechanics of

Congressional reform at another time, and by another Committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,  
Member of Congress.

#### EXPANDING SHORTAGES

### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been made more aware in recent months of the possible hardships we may encounter when a vital resource is in short supply.

Unfortunately, our diminishing supply of mineral resources is not limited to petroleum. There is a long list of minerals that are currently in short supply or will become scarce in the near future, including aluminum, chromium, asbestos, copper, iron, lead, manganese, nickel, phosphorus, potassium, and zinc. At the present time the demand of the United States for such minerals is fast outstripping supply. The pinch will grow worse in the immediate future as other developed nations increase their demands on world resources.

A partial answer to this dilemma lies in the amendment I am introducing to the Foreign Aid Act of 1973. This amendment grants the President authority to exchange, when he determines it to be in the national interest, the assistance furnished under the bill for strategic materials and fossil fuels which are either in short supply or which cannot be produced in this country to meet our requirements.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent column by Ray Cromley that appeared in the January 9 issue of the Washington Star-News and details the coming crisis in materials shortages:

[From the Washington Star-News, Jan. 9, 1974]

#### EXPANDING SHORTAGES

(By Ray Cromley)

This reporter has come across some appalling findings in studies made for the Nixon administration on future materials shortages, of which fuel is but one.

If you think you're facing burdensome scarcities now, wait another 26 years. By that time, if the men who have calculated trends in basic commodities haven't gone astray, there will be heavy shortages across the board—for fuel, iron ore, copper, aluminum, zinc, sulfur, food and a host of other materials too numerous to mention.

The cause in each case is simple and unavoidable. The world is getting richer. Industry is growing on every continent. Agricultural production is up, despite occasional lapses. Men and women in Europe, Asia, Latin America, Africa and Oceania want to live better. Wages are moving up. Consumer spending is increasing. All this means a demand for more steel, aluminum, copper, zinc, sulfur, fluorspar, meat, cheese, milk and a host of other materials and commodities.

Leaving the United States out of the picture, world demand for most strategic materials will be from three to four or five times what it is now. And all this before your 10-year-old child reaches his 37th birthday.

Russia will be an important factor in the

scarcities 26 years hence. Its demand for aluminum, already sizable, will multiply by five. Its requirements for the other major materials mentioned will increase to three to four times what they are now. Though these percentage increases are not large in comparison with the expected worldwide increase in demand, Russia starts from such a large base the effect on world supply will be considerable.

In the same measure, Japan's needs and those of Western Europe will cut heavily into supplies. Japan's expected demand for aluminum 26 years from now is expected to be 10 times what it is today. That island country is expected to use three to five times as much of other major raw materials.

Percentage-wise, Western Europe's needs for the major materials studied here will rise a mere 200 percent or so. But in tonnages, the growth in European consumption will be large.

China is expected to increase its requirements for iron ore and steel, copper, aluminum, zinc and sulfur four to fivefold.

The resulting competition will reduce the U.S. share of copper from around 29 percent today to roughly 22 percent 26 years from now, of aluminum from 40 percent to 33, of zinc from 27 percent to 21, of liquid fuels from 35 percent to 25, of iron ore from 21 percent to 13. Of course, in most cases these will be smaller shares of a larger pie. But that advantage will be offset by a U.S. demand growing by leaps and bounds—a demand which will, 26 years from now if these estimates are correct, be two to three to four times as great for these essential materials. Our need for aluminum, for example, is expected to more than quadruple. Our consumption of energy will likely roughly triple. Our use of iron ore and steel will double.

As a result, competition for these goods will increase costs, perhaps disastrously, just as competition for scarce supplies is today driving the price of petroleum to unbelievable levels.

These forecasts take into account intensified efforts to find and exploit available resources of raw materials. They also assume we will mine deposits not now economical. However these efforts will not solve the overall shortages.

New approaches must be found. One partial solution: discovering materials in plentiful supply which can be used as substitutes. Another partial answer: new approaches which do away in part for the need for one scarce material or another. In some cases, more efficient use of a commodity can result in huge savings.

Such changes of course have been taking place for some time. Aluminum is frequently substituted for copper. Nuclear energy has been gradually adding to the power supply, reducing by that much the potential demand for petroleum and low-sulfur coal. Man-made fibers have substituted for silk in hosiery. Synthetics have substituted for wool and cotton in much of our clothing. Manufactured rubber has replaced the natural in many uses.

These efforts will have to be multiplied if we are not to retrench far more than most of us desire.

#### ALBANY PARK'S IMPROVEMENT AND BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to an imaginative program of community

involvement for the improvement and beautification of Albany Park, an integral part of Northwest Side of Chicago and of the 11th Congressional District I am proud to represent.

The program's innovative founder and resourceful director, Roy S. Vergo, is vice president of the National Bank of Albany Park, Northeast chairman of the American Cancer Society, student adviser on urban and social problems at Northeastern Illinois University, and longtime activist and dedicated leader in various community projects.

Roy Vergo realized that to reverse the exodus to the suburbs, local business leaders, political leaders, and civic organizations had to join together and create a sense of community pride and civic awareness. Alderman Anthony C. Laurino and Milton Bronstein joined the project enthusiastically and now are part of the day-to-day program. Roy Vergo emphasized that the community's bank, the National Bank of Albany Park, was not going to redline the area, and received the backing of the president, Mr. Irwin Goodman, and the board of directors to offer an interest rate discount on rehabilitation loans to local residents.

These leaders pointed out that Albany Park already has access to expressways and mass transit, several excellent colleges, active and enthusiastic community organizations, and a new rapid transit terminal under construction.

Through newspaper advertisements, radio announcements in the languages of the area's four major ethnic groups, and newsletters, the residents of Albany Park are being encouraged to join together, reverse blight and deterioration in the area, and put the "park" back into Albany Park.

The bank has already spearheaded the new rapid transit project and Roy Vergo is taking successful action on four priority distress properties. Private citizens and local governments are working on curb, street, and alley repairs and property owners are putting in new sidewalks. In addition to loan financing the bank is supplementing these invaluable human resources with advice on contracts, contractors, and general rehabilitation.

Results are beginning to show, renewing the faith of residents in the future of their community. The strong backing for this program by the National Bank of Albany Park has led to expressions of interest by other companies in the area, such as Commonwealth Edison, to join in rehabilitation efforts. A home improvement show is being cosponsored by the bank to exhibit every imaginable type of home remodeling, and 5,000 free admission tickets have been printed for distribution in the Albany Park area.

I congratulate the board of directors of the National Bank of Albany Park, the bank's president, Irwin Goodman, and vice president, Roy Vergo, for their spirit of service and the inspirational leadership they have shown. Albany Park will, indeed, remain a good place to live and work because of these farsighted and compassionate efforts.

CXX—13—Part 1

## WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Star News by Mr. R. Stephen Scott, science writer and president of the Federal Editors Association, describes well the significance of our national space program and its relationship to our daily lives. As three astronauts orbit above our heads and continue to set records of endurance, performance and contributions, it is well to remember that the opportunity to utilize space to the ever increasing advantage of our Nation can be achieved with a relatively modest investment. Mr. Scott's article follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, Dec. 30, 1973]

#### WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(By R. Stephen Scott)

If, 50 years ago, someone had seriously predicted that before 1970 men would journey to the moon or live below the sea, skeptics would have accused him of reading too much science fiction. If that same person had had the courage to add that millions of people would watch such strange events in the comfort of their homes, saner minds would have suggested he take an ice bath.

Today, much of Jules Verne's science fiction has become fact. Science and technology have opened the frontiers of space and the ocean. While a lack of financial funding prohibits probes into these frontiers on the scale of the Man On the Moon and Man Into the Sea programs of the 1960s, the search for knowledge about these frontiers still goes on. A Pioneer spacecraft flies by Jupiter and marine scientists perform ecological research in the ocean environment.

No one man has done more to open the underwater world than Jacques Cousteau. In 1942 he joined with engineer, Emile Gagnan, to develop the aqualung. In Cousteau's own words, "his device "allowed divers to have enough time to explore the world of silence." Since then, Cousteau has taken millions of people on tours into his "silent world" via a series of televised adventures. Now, Cousteau and diver-journalist, Philippe Diole, have decided to re-create the "Undersea World" series in print. "Three Adventures," the sixth in an eventual 26 volume set, describes Cousteau's investigation of the Galapagos archipelago, Lake Titicaca, and the "Blue Holes" of the Bahamas.

A search for ruins of a legendary Incan civilization and giant mute frogs are featured in the Lake Titicaca story. In the account of the "Blue Holes"—enormous rings of coral that encircle lakes of blue water in the open sea—Cousteau's divers search for legendary monsters, only to discover a geologic Gothic cloister. Both chronicles offer informative and exciting glimpses of the mysteries of the undersea world told in a diary-lecture style, but neither compares to the Galapagos story.

The Galapagos, located just below the Equator about 600 miles west of South America, was Charles Darwin's "laboratory of evolution". It was in 1838 that Darwin, a 26 year old naturalist, aboard the research ship, HMS Beagle, first visited the island chain. Later he wrote, "The facts concerning the species of this archipelago are at the basis of all my opinions."

Two species of wildlife were important to

Darwin in confirming his theories. The dragon-like marine iguana and the finch—a species which, from island to island, shows a diversity in form or in beak development corresponding to differences in their habits and their nourishment. Over the centuries, these differences had resulted in the appearance of varieties of finches best adapted to survive in the conditions dominant on different islands of archipelago. This, for Darwin, confirmed his ideas on evolution.

The complexity of the fauna of the Galapagos results from its special location. This chain of volcanic islands is at the confluence of the warm currents from the North and the cold current from the southeast—the Humboldt Current. This mixture of waters has produced a strong mixture of tropical and polar species. There are penguins and albatrosses, sea lions and seals, as well as iguanas, turtle, and even warm-water snakes. And, while this temperature mix often creates a dense and dangerous fog, it also produces an abundance of plankton in the waters of the archipelago. This means a plentiful habitat for marine life.

Armed with cameras, technological know-how and the equipment of Calypso, as well as with a team of expert divers, Cousteau was able to investigate the Galapagos with means Darwin never imagined. Thus, in "Three Adventures," the reader can learn of phenomena which Darwin once observed and "experience the thrill he must have felt in his own time."

Cousteau does not have a market on scientific thrills. In the 1960's science and technology combined to examine phenomena such as pulsars, quasars, and blackholes, that a decade earlier were not mentioned in scientific journals. From above the earth's atmosphere, solar winds and stellar X-rays were measured. And, man took his first step on the moon. It was a decade of a hundred Galileos.

Since then, space exploration has taken an earth-oriented perspective as typified by NASA's Earth Resources Technology Satellite (ERTS) program. However, the information generated in those 10 years is still expanding man's knowledge of the celestial environment. Even as the Pioneer spacecraft approaches Jupiter, and the comet, Kohoutek, speeds closer to Earth, the volume of space science information multiplies.

UFOs add spice, but even without them, the space beyond earth is filled with fascination. In his latest "Pictorial Guide to the Planets," science teacher-writer, Joseph Jackson, provides an up-to-date (1972) source of information about the fascinations of the ever-expanding universe.

The title of Jackson's "Guide" is somewhat misleading, for while the book is amply illustrated with close-up photographs of the moon, Mars, comets—"the giant dirty snowballs"—and other solar phenomena, it also presents an easy-to-read, yet authoritative, description of them. Of particular interest, perhaps because of its curiosity appeal, is Jackson's discussion of the possibility of life on other planets.

Mercury and Venus are too hot to support life, but the Mariner probes of Mars have not ruled out the possibilities of life there. According to Jackson, "The data from Mariner 9 already reported do increase the probability that life may have started and developed on the planet at some time in the past, perhaps when conditions were more favorable. The odds for the existence of life on Mars in the past, if not at present as well, seem higher than the odds against it."

The chances for life on the outer planets are slim. It is more probable on larger satellites such as Saturn's Titan, or Jupiter's Ganymede, although the extreme cold and probable lack of atmosphere militate against any forms of living things similar to those

on earth. However, it is near certainty that life is not unique to Earth. There are at least 100,000 stars in the Milky Way Galaxy that could have planets with an environment capable of supporting living things.

Jackson reports that "a respectable number" of scientists believe that messages are coming from other worlds. "Should signals of this kind be detected, the significance of such a discovery would be inestimable." Earth scientists have in fact placed a message aboard the Pioneer spacecraft should any intelligence spot it.

Cornell's Carl Sagan once observed, "Today the exploration of the Earth's surface has been completed. For the joys of discovery and the lure of the frontier, we must look to the oceans and the skies." While professor Sagan's hyperbole may irritate many in the scientific community, the motivation for it can be found on the pages of Cousteau's "Three Adventures" and Jackson's "Pictorial Guide to the Planets."

#### NEW MANEUVERING REENTRY VEHICLE

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Navy is planning to develop and eventually deploy a revolutionary, new maneuvering reentry vehicle—MaRV—missile on the Trident submarine according to an unclassified portion of a Pentagon document which I publicly released this past weekend.

The Navy's plan, Mr. Speaker, is either foolish or dangerous or both. MaRV is an escalation of the arms race beyond the so-called MIRV missiles.

A MaRV warhead can independently maneuver after release from a missile while a MIRV warhead simply falls from the sky without independent terminal guidance after its release from the ICBM missiles.

Traditionally there have been two justifications for building a MaRV missile—either as protection from ABM defenses or to improve the accuracy of our warheads. If the Navy is planning this missile to protect against ABM, it is frankly a foolish idea. On the other hand, if it is to improve missile accuracy, it is a dangerous move that may lead the Russians to conclude that the United States is trying to develop some form of first strike capability. In any case, it will be a multibillion addition to our already mammoth defense budget.

As my colleagues know, the SALT I treaty limits both the United States and the Soviet Union to two ABM sites.

There is no real justification for developing a MaRV to protect against ABM since the defense missiles have been limited by the SALT accords. In short, MaRV would be a multibillion dollar project to counter a nonexistent threat.

Supporting this view, at least indirectly, is an Air Force statement written in response to a question from the Senate Armed Services Committee in May 1973. The Air Force said that "a maneuvering reentry vehicle would be very inefficient against an undefended target."

If the MaRV plan for the Trident missile is not a defense against the ABM, it is probably designed to improve missile accuracy. As some of my colleagues may know, in recent weeks, Defense Secretary James Schlesinger has publicly indicated interest in improved accuracy in our missiles. His statements appear to be evidence confirming the view that the Navy wants an advanced reentry vehicle to improve accuracy.

Improving accuracy ordinarily sounds like an excellent concept, but under present circumstances, improvement would be a serious mistake. Missile accuracy is already excellent and any improved accuracy would be the difference of a few hundred feet—not miles—at the cost of billions of dollars. When there is a nuclear explosion, there is little difference if you are at ground zero or a few hundred feet from ground zero.

It appears that the probable design of the advanced MaRV is to destroy hardened Russian missile silos—a move that could destabilize our entire deterrent strategy. The Russians may respond to this in such a way that it could kick off a whole new round in the arms race. In short, MaRV is a multibillion dollar program that would not enhance overall strategic efficiency but could be perceived by the Soviet Union as an effort to develop some form of first-strike capability.

Dr. Schlesinger has repeatedly denied that the United States is interested in developing a first-strike force. The Russians, like the United States, have existing submarine ballistic missiles which would be invulnerable to the MaRV, but to the Russians who may not know the state of ASW—antisubmarine warfare—capabilities, developing a MaRV to kill silos may look like an effort to achieve first-strike force.

It is possible that the Pentagon sees development of the MaRV on the Trident submarine as a bargaining chip in the upcoming SALT talks. But other programs have been justified as bargaining chips and too many chips may have the opposite effect on the negotiations.

Of course, the new MaRV on Trident could be a simple political deal between the Joint Chiefs and Dr. Schlesinger. It is no secret that the Joint Chiefs are always looking for new and better toys and, of course, this new program could be a boost to defense contractors who are always hungry for more business.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that Congress was not consulted before this decision was made. MaRV should be a No. 1 strategic issue in this year's defense debate in Congress. Both the House and Senate should fully debate the strategic implications of this move.

I have asked today, Defense Secretary Schlesinger to fully disclose the Pentagon's plans to Congress. I am interested in learning precisely what kind of MaRV was also planned for other strategic forces such as the Minuteman missile.

According to the unclassified paragraph sent on January 14, 1974, by Deputy Secretary William P. Clements, Jr.—

The restructured Trident program approved recently . . . includes advanced development effort for a maneuvering re-entry vehicle (MaRV). The budget for Trident was increased by \$21.9 million due for the most part to the add-on of advanced development for MaRV. . . .

Mr. Speaker, MaRV should be fully debated and considered by this House before it is approved. It is a potential escalation of the arms race we and future generations can ill afford.

H. M. "JOHNNY" JONES

### HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, at the start of this new year a landmark event occurred in Iowa journalism, the sale of the Monticello Express to three of its most dedicated employees and the retirement after 20 years of its editor-publisher, H. M. "Johnny" Jones. The Monticello Express has long been a byword of lively, penetrating, and responsible community journalism in eastern Iowa. But its example and influence have spread across Iowa and the Nation as a whole. It is recognized in its content, makeup, and in its technical innovations as a leader and yardstick for other weeklies and dailies.

These multiple accomplishments owe much to the vision, enterprise, and human qualities of Johnny Jones. The offices of the Express have been a mecca for other editors, publishers, and reporters who wish to find the secrets of its extraordinary success and the reasons for its countless awards in all aspects of newspaper activity. For Monticello, Johnny Jones and his wife Evelyn have been continuous sources of new inspiration and community service. All Iowans are grateful that his "retirement" represents only a change of direction, since he will remain professionally active in several fields, especially as president of Publishers Idea Exchange. But I am sure that his 20 years with the Express will always remain as the most luminous pages in his career which may be equalled but not excelled in the many years which lie ahead for Johnny Jones.

Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Jones' farewell editorial as well as a lead article describing the sale of the paper, its new publishers, and the role which Johnny Jones has played in its development since 1954. The articles follow:

AN EDITOR'S FOND FAREWELL . . .

As all things have a beginning . . . so all things must have an ending.

Nearly 20 years ago, a red-haired editor wrote his first editorial in the Monticello Express.

Now . . . with hair nearly white . . . he must write his last.

Today's front page announces the sale of the Express to three fine young staff members, in whom we have unlimited trust and confidence.

Perhaps you've noticed that for many of

those years the Express has proudly carried on its flag the sentence, "One of America's Greatest Weeklies."

Some of you may have considered it just another empty claim. This editor put it there because we believed it belonged there, fair and square.

You see, throughout those 20 years, we attempted to bring you the very finest newspaper that a wild Irish editor and a talented and dedicated staff could hammer together. We tried our level best to print all the news, accurately and impartially, without fear or favor. And, we thought we called a spade a spade.

We wanted nothing but the very best for our community and for all the people we served. So, all of us tried to give most generously of our hearts and minds, our time and effort, and from our pocketbooks.

In short, we wanted the Express to be everything a great newspaper should be . . . and we wanted to help our area be every bit as great as we thought it ought to be.

Whether this editor succeeded or failed, only you know.

If we failed, the fault is this editor's alone.

If we succeeded, even partially, it was because of the wonderful people listed below. We owe you all a debt of such magnitude it will take a lifetime to pay.

Our family for understanding that they must live much of the time without a father who often had three meetings during the day plus two more at night.

Our friends. Without your help, advice and encouragement there were times when we might not have been able to face the dawn.

Our critics. You kept our head from getting too large for our hat, and enabled us to see things much clearer.

Our advertisers. Without your loyal support every editorial might have been our last. And, you enabled those who had loaned us money to sleep a little better.

Our readers. Your friendship and encouragement inspired us all . . . like the time not one of you complained when our first offset issues were so terrible.

Our staff, the greatest in the nation. You did all the excellent work for which we got the credit, and you covered up most of our silly mistakes.

Bob Goodyear, Betty Wagner and Ken Moats. No finer young leaders exist in Iowa. The fact that you have been in complete charge of the Express these past two years should serve as proof to all that, with your talent, youth and vigor, this newspaper will climb to fresh, new heights.

Fate . . . which permits us to continue to make our home near Monticello, the city we love beyond all others, among the people we love and respect.

But more than all of these, we're thankful to you, yes you, for letting us have the privilege of devoting 96,126 working hours of our life to the publication of your Express.

We said "your" Express. You see, it never really belonged to us. For 109 years it's been your Express. You just loaned it to us for a little while.

—H. M. J.

#### EXPRESS SOLD TO THREE LONG-TIME EMPLOYEES

The sale of the Monticello Express, effective Jan. 1, 1974, is announced today by H. M. "Johnny" Jones, its publisher since Nov. 1, 1954.

Purchasing the 109-year-old newspaper is a new corporation, The Monticello Express, Inc., formed by three long-time employees, each a department head with the publication. The new copublishers are:

Robert Goodyear, production superintendent since 1965. He will serve as president of the new corporation.

Ken Moats, advertising manager since 1964, will be vice president.

Betty Wagner, news editor from 1961 to 1969 and editor since 1969, is secretary-treasurer.

The three co-publishers said that no changes are planned in either personnel or in the operation of the Express.

#### THROUGH RANKS

Goodyear's rise within the ranks of the Express staff has been highly unusual. He joined the newspaper as a part-time production worker as a high school junior in 1954, rose to head his department in ten years, and now becomes co-owner.

He has been responsible for the entire production of the Express, and in charge of its rapidly expanding commercial printing department which now does considerable publication work, and serves color printing customers over three states.

Bob is a graduate of the University of Iowa's newspaper production laboratory, and he and his wife Janice live in Langworthy with their two daughters and a son.

#### VARIED BACKGROUND

Moats attended Naval Journalists school and spent four years in the service working with news media.

Deciding on a career in the business side, he spent 18 months as advertising manager of the Winner, S.D., Advocate, then a year as an advertising assistant on the Webster City Daily Freeman-Journal. He joined the Express as advertising manager in 1964.

Under his direction the Express staff has won many awards for advertising excellence, both state and national.

He and his wife Marilyn have two sons and three daughters, and live at 128 N. Maple. He is past president of the Greater Monticello Committee.

#### MANY HONORS

Betty Wagner graduated from Central Missouri State College, after winning a long list of honors, and working for Missouri newspapers as a reporter. She joined the Express as a reporter and photographer in 1960, became news editor in 1961 and editor in 1969.

In complete charge of news, she has received many personal honors as a journalist and played a vital role in the scores of awards won by the Express for reporting, photography, editorials and newspapers excellence.

She is past president of Iowa Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. and of the Monticello club, and has been active in local and area community affairs.

#### EXPRESS HISTORY

The Express was born July 10, 1865, upstairs in the building south across the street from the new Monticello State bank building. It's first editor was O. D. Crane.

It saw a succession of editors until Dec. 3, 1883, when it was to be published for 71 years by the Doxsee family. Three generations of Doxsees were at the helm of the newspaper until it was sold in 1954 to a corporation headed by Jones.

The Express rose to state-wide prominence during the reign of the late J. W. Doxsee (editor from 1883 to 1915) and the late Charles Doxsee (editor from 1915 to 1948).

It was published in several locations but from 1901 to 1954 was housed on the second floor of the former Lovell building, although the newspaper press was located on the ground floor behind the larger building.

#### CHANGES BEGAN

The first change came with the moving of the plant to its present location, the former William G. Schoon building since purchased by Jones.

The second change came when the Express was converted from a community newspaper to an area newspaper. New rural correspondents were added, along with area news and photos.

In February 1958, after a year of intensive study, the Express was converted to an en-

tirely new method of printing . . . from hot-metal-letterpress to cold-type photo-offset. Every piece of letterpress equipment was removed and replaced with offset equipment without missing a publication date or even being late.

The Express was one of the first newspapers in the entire nation to make the complete change-over.

From 1954 to date the paid circulation of the Express has nearly doubled, and it grew from the smallest newspaper in Jones county to the largest. Its volume of sales is nearly four times the 1954 figure.

#### MUCH PIONEERING

The next pioneering step taken by the Express was to assist sister publications in developing the state's first central printing plant at Independence, with the purchase of Iowa's first high-speed web-offset press in 1962.

The most recent change came in 1970 when the Express became the first community newspaper in Iowa to switch to computer setting of all its type, now rapidly being adopted by other papers.

Other innovations made by the Express was the departmentalizing of its news, grouping all sports, farm and women's news together within departments for easy reading.

Also changing from the hard-to-read broadsheet page size to a compact tabloid format, as well as improvements in type faces, page make-up and design . . . all widely copied within the newspaper field.

#### RECORD HONORS

During the past 20 years the Express and its staff members have won 132 national and state awards for newspaper excellence. So far as is known, no other American newspaper, either weekly or daily, has won as many.

The plaques and certificates cover every spectrum of the newspaper field, and for many years adorned the walls of the Express office. With extensive remodeling of the building this past summer most of the awards have been placed in a scrap book, with only a few left on display.

Perhaps most pleasing to its staff is the fact that, in recent years, each improvement made by the Express has been widely copied by newspapers across the nation. During its conversion to offset more than 300 newspaper publishers from as far away as Pennsylvania and Texas made special trips to Monticello to see what the Express was doing.

#### RETIRING PUBLISHER

Jones began his newspaper career at the age of ten, carrying an early morning paper route for the old Burlington Hawkeye. In high school he became a "jack-of-all-trades" on his hometown weekly newspaper, later working for a small daily as wire editor, then assistant advertising manager.

After nearly a year with the Des Moines Register & Tribune advertising department, he joined the Waverly Newspapers as advertising manager until World War II began.

He spent four years in service, two years in Europe as an officer with an infantry division. He participated in the invasion of France, the Battle of the Bulge and five major battles.

In 1946 he joined the Independence Bulletin-Journal as business manager, and in 1950 with partner Reeves Hall and two other associates bought the competing Independence Conservative.

#### BUYS EXPRESS

In 1954 with Hall he bought the Monticello Express.

In 1969 he purchased Publishers Idea Exchange, an advertising idea magazine distributed throughout the U.S., Canada and Mexico, and in 1970 sold his interest in the Independence Newspapers to partner Hall.

In 1973, with other associates, he again purchased the Independence Newspapers and

central printing plant, along with the coming Wapsi Reminder.

Although he never earned a college degree, in 1953 he was elected to Alpha Delta Sigma, professional advertising fraternity, and in 1962 to Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic fraternity.

He is a member of the board of directors of the Iowa Press association, past president of the Greater Monticello committee, past president of the Monticello Rotary club, and is on the board of directors of the Monticello Development Corp.

Jones serves on the GMC's roads committee, the doctor procurement committee, the AFS committee, and for many years has been active in nearly every community betterment movement.

He is a member of the American Legion, the VFW, and the Disabled Veterans of America.

He and his wife Evelyn, who has also been active in community affairs, are the parents of four children:

The oldest, Mike, is an ex-Marine now studying at Kirkwood college and living in Cedar Rapids. Marsha Ann (Mrs. Paul Ponder) lives here. Kim is a student at Luther college, and Beth is in eighth grade.

Jones is president of the Monticello Publishing Co., president of Publishers Idea Exchange, Inc., vice president of the Manchester Publishing Co., and vice president of Pincon Publishing Co. at Independence.

D.C. HOME RULE—CITY COUNCIL,  
MAYOR, JUDICIARY

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent summary of the new D.C. home rule law just passed by Congress and signed by the President on December 24, 1973, has been prepared by Prof. Jason I. Newman and Mr. Jerry McGowan. Professor Newman is director of the D.C. Project on Community Legal Assistance of Georgetown University Law Center.

I have unanimous consent to enter the first portion of this summary dealing with the city council, the Mayor, and the judiciary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The summary follows:

I. CITY COUNCIL

A. Structure

(1) *Number.* 13 members elected on a Partisan basis—Chairman and 4 members elected at large. For the first election, not more than 2 (excluding the chairman) shall be nominated by the same political party. Thereafter, because of the staggered terms, a political party may nominate only 1 at-large candidate (excluding the chairman) so that there could only be at any one time a maximum of 3 at-large councilmen (including chairman) from any one party.

(2) *Term.* 4 years with one-half of the council to be elected every two years.

(3) *Qualifications—*

(a) qualified elector.  
(b) resident of ward running from.  
(c) resident and domiciliary of the District for at least 1 year prior to the election.  
(d) holds no other public office, but can be privately employed.

(4) *Compensation—*

(a) *Council Members.* G.S. 12 last step is the initial salary (\$22,705). The Council

after a 2-year period can increase or decrease their compensation.

(b) *Chairman.* The chairman receives an additional \$10,000/year but he may not engage in any other employment whether as an employee or self-employed individual.

B. Powers

(1) Has authority over the entire D.C. Code subject to the limitations listed below.

(2) Retains its existing authority.

(3) Has authority to reorganize the D. C. government structure.

(4) Has authority to investigate any matter relating to the District. The Council in this regard can issue a subpoena.

C. Limitations

(1) *Congressional Reservation of Power—* The Council may not:

(a) tax any federal or state property,  
(b) lend the public credit for any private undertaking,

(c) enact any act relating to the organization and jurisdiction of the D.C. courts (Title 11, D.C. Code),

(d) tax the personal income of any non-resident of the District,

(e) change building height limitations in the District,

(f) enact any act with respect to the Commission on Mental Health,

(g) enact any act relating to the U.S. Courts, the U.S. Attorney or the U.S. Marshall in the District of Columbia,

(h) change the D.C. criminal laws until January 1, 1977 (Titles 22, 23, 24 D.C. Code).

(i) legislate on any matter not exclusively applicable to the District.

D. Legislative procedure

(1) Council passes, Mayor has 10 days to either approve or veto;  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the Council present and voting may override Mayor's veto unless the President within 30 days sustains the Mayor's veto.

(2) Council transmits all but emergency acts to the Congress for a 30-day layover. If Congress does not adopt a concurrent resolution disapproving of such act, it goes into effect at the end of that 30-day period.

(3) An emergency act passed by  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the entire Council can take effect immediately but it can remain in effect no longer than 90 days.

(4) A majority of the Council constitutes a quorum for the transaction of Council business.

E. Chairman

(1) The chairman is the presiding officer of the Council.

(2) When the office of Mayor is vacant, the chairman shall act in his place.

(3) While he is acting Mayor, he cannot exercise any of his power as Chairman or member of the Council.

II. MAYOR

A. Structure

(1) *Election.* Partisan.

(2) *Qualification.—*

(a) qualified elector.  
(b) resident and domiciliary of the District for 1 year prior to election.

(c) holds no other public office.

(d) nor be engaged in any employment whether as an employee or as a self-employed individual.

(3) *Term.* 4 years.

(4) *Compensation.—*

(a) Executive level III (\$40,000) plus an official allowance.  
(b) Changeable by Council—but any change would take effect at the beginning of the next term of the Mayor.

(5) *Vacancy.* Special election with Council Chairman acting as Mayor until such special election.

B. Powers and duties

(1) The Executive power of the District shall be vested in the Mayor who is the Chief Executive Officer of the District.

(2) All functions that the Mayor now has he retains unless it is inconsistent with this act.

(3) The Mayor shall designate the officer or officers of the executive department who shall during disability or absence of the Mayor and Council, execute and perform the duties of the Mayor.

(4) The Mayor shall administer the personnel system.

(5) The Mayor may delegate his functions to any officer or employee of the executive branch.

(6) The Mayor shall appoint a city administrator who shall serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The city administrator shall be paid at a rate established by the Mayor, not to exceed executive level IV. (just a little less than the Mayor).

(7) The Mayor may reorganize the offices, agencies, etc., of the executive branch by submitting to Council a detailed plan of such reorganization. Such a plan shall be valid only if the Council does not adopt within 60 days a resolution disapproving such reorganization.

(8) The Mayor shall have charge of the administration of the financial affairs of the District and in that regard he shall assess property and collect taxes.

(9) The Mayor becomes the central planning agency for the District.

*Personnel—*The Council within 5 years must establish a merit personnel system which can be independent of the Federal Civil Service and can include Collective Bargaining.

III. JUDICIARY

(Relates only to the Superior Court and the D.C. Court of Appeals).

A. Appointment of judges

The President nominates with the advice and consent of the Senate all judges of the D.C. Courts. The President must choose a judge, for each vacancy, from a list of 3 persons recommended to him by the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission.

*B. D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission.* The commission shall consist of 7 members, serving for terms of 6 years, selected as follows:

(a) One member appointed by the President.

(b) Two members appointed by the Board of Governors of the unified D.C. Bar.

(c) Two members appointed by the Mayor, one of whom shall not be a lawyer.

(d) One member appointed by the Council, and shall be a person other than a lawyer.

(e) One member shall be appointed by the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and such member shall be an active or retired Federal judge serving in the District.

C. Qualifications for judges

(1) U.S. citizen.

(2) An active member of unified D.C. bar and has been engaged in the active practice of law in D.C. for the 5 years prior to his nomination or for such 5 years been on the faculty of a law school in the District or has been employed as a lawyer by the U.S. or D.C. government.

(3) Resided in D.C. for at least 90 days prior to the nomination and shall remain a resident while judge.

(4) Recommended to the President for such nomination and appointment by the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission.

(5) Has not been a member of the Tenure Commission or D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission for at least 2 years prior to nomination.

D. Term

15 years subject to mandatory retirement at age 70.

**E. Chief Judge**

He is chosen from among the judges of the court in regular active service by the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission. He serves as chief judge for a term of 4 years and is eligible for reappointment.

**F. Reappointment**

(1) There is established a D.C. Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure (hereinafter the Tenure Commission) consisting of 7 members selected in the same manner as the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission. No member can serve on both boards at the same time.

(2) At least 3 months prior to the expiration of his term, a judge may file with the Tenure Commission a declaration of candidacy for reappointment. The Tenure Commission will then evaluate the judge's performance as being either exceptionally well qualified, well qualified, qualified, or unqualified. If he is found to be either exceptionally well qualified or well qualified, he will be automatically reappointed for another term. If he is found to be qualified, the President may or may not appoint him for another term. If he is found to be unqualified, he may not be nominated for another term.

**G. Removal, Suspension and Involuntary Retirement**

(1) The Tenure Commission can initiate proceedings to have a judge removed from office if he has been convicted of a felony.

(2) The Tenure Commission can initiate to have a judge removed after a determination by the Tenure Commission of:

(a) willful and persistent failure to perform judicial duties.

(b) willful misconduct in office.

(c) any other conduct which is prejudicial to the administration of justice or which brings the judicial office into disrepute.

(3) A judge may be involuntarily retired from office if:

(a) The Tenure Commission determines that a judge suffers from a mental or physical disability which is likely to seriously interfere with the proper performances of his judicial duties.

(b) And the order of involuntary retirement is affirmed on appeal by the D.C. Court of Appeals or if the time within which an appeal may be taken from the order has expired.

(4) A judge shall be suspended without salary upon the initiation of any of the proceedings in paragraphs 1 or 2. The suspension shall continue until a termination of all appeals. If the judge is reinstated, he shall recover his salary and all rights and privileges of his office.

(5) Upon the filing of an order of involuntary retirement, a judge shall be suspended with such retirement salary as he is entitled to. The suspension shall continue until a termination of all appeals. If he is reinstated, he shall recover his salary and all rights and privileges of his office.

**NUCLEAR ENERGY: RISKS MAY FAR OUTWEIGH POTENTIAL BENEFITS****HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, one immediate reaction to the current petroleum shortage has been rising demands for large-scale new investment for nuclear power sources.

Yet, despite the clamor, there are significant factors we must consider before giving in to such pressures. Dangers

to all life forms could result from a safety accident; much of the technology is either unproven or extremely costly; the question of waste material disposal remains unanswered; there are major perils from sabotage or homemade bombs; effects of natural disasters often are not considered.

Over the past months, the Los Angeles Times has carried an important series of articles analyzing both the potential gains and dangers associated with nuclear energy. I applaud the Times for this valuable perspective, and I urge my colleagues to read them.

Today, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the December 17, 1973, Los Angeles Times by Lee Dye entitled "Nuclear Energy: Great Hopes, Great Problems."

The article follows:

**NUCLEAR ENERGY: GREAT HOPES, GREAT PROBLEMS**

(By Lee Dye)

The nuclear industry may well have the best safety record of any major industry in the history of the United States.

It has been subjected to examination and scrutiny on a level that is without parallel.

Some of the most brilliant minds in the world are working to see that the industry does not destroy us while trying to save us.

The tools of its trade are equipped with automatic and redundant safety features that make such things as automotive airbags seem terribly crude.

Yet in spite of all of that, the industry is haunted by critics who refuse to go away. It seems at times that some people never will be satisfied.

Why?

Perhaps UC San Diego's Nobel Prize-winning physicist Dr. Hannes Alfvén pinpointed the reason when he observed that the nuclear industry relies on a level of perfection in which "no acts of God can be permitted."

In short, although the nuclear industry has the capacity for doing great things for mankind, it also has the capacity for unleashing catastrophes of such magnitude that all other problems seem pale by comparison.

Some of the problems have been the subject of much shouting and yelling in the past. But others are just now being discussed in whispers.

And as if all this were not enough, the beleaguered industry has problems of its own. Its power plants have not proved reliable, and today, at the height of the energy crisis when the industry had expected to move into prime time, many of its plants are shut down or operating on a limited level.

Southern California has only one nuclear power plant, and it has been closed for six weeks and will be closed until sometime after the first of the year.

New England has five nuclear power plants—only one of which is operating now at full capacity. One has been inoperable for 10 of the past 12 months.

The most pressing questions today, however, strike directly at the issue of public safety rather than plant reliability.

Adding punch to the issue are the conclusions of some of the top nuclear physicists in the world, experts within the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) itself, a prestigious international scientific organization, and U.S. governmental agencies. Briefly, the questions center on:

Reactor safety. The most important safety feature in any nuclear power plant is the emergency core cooling system, but no full-scale test ever has been conducted to see if the system will work.

Breeders. Because of the shortage of uranium, this country already has committed itself to the fast breeder reactor, which makes more fuel than it uses. However, the breeder is an unproven technology, and many experts contend that breeders will be many times more hazardous than the present generation of reactors.

Sabotage. This subject is so disturbing that it never has been discussed fully and openly. But there is mounting concern over nuclear facilities as targets for terrorists.

Homemade bombs. As nuclear facilities proliferate, the opportunities increase for diversion of bomb-grade nuclear materials that would permit terrorists to build their own atomic bombs. In addition, such countries as Cuba probably will soon have nuclear weapons, possibly built with materials diverted from the peaceful use of the atom.

Radioactive waste. Although the nation is moving fully into the nuclear age, no method has been developed for disposing of deadly radioactive waste products that must be isolated from man's environment for thousands of years.

Acts of God. Although, as Alfvén observed, they are not permitted, acts of God could wipe out in a single stroke all of the safety features built into nuclear facilities. The San Fernando earthquake occurred along an "unknown" fault, and had it been much closer to a nuclear power plant the results could have been catastrophic.

As a top AEC executive observed in a Carmel conference in September, 1971:

"When an earthquake occurs near a nuclear power plant, every feature of the plant will be affected to some degree by the earthquake. Complex multiple failures may occur. If the nuclear power plant is not adequately designed and constructed to withstand the earthquake effects, the potential exists for the concurrent loss of fuel integrity and loss of function of the redundant systems and barriers which prevent radioactivity release."

In view of that, it is a little difficult for the critics to understand why the government is just now getting around to conducting extensive seismic surveys of the area immediately offshore from a major new nuclear power complex that is more than half completed near San Luis Obispo.

But so much for earthquakes. What about the built-in safety systems? Will they work, God permitting?

The most controversial part of any reactor today is the emergency core cooling system. This system would deliver borated water to the reactor core in the event that the primary cooling water was lost. The emergency coolant would keep the reactor from overheating to the point of melting, which could result in the release of radioactivity.

The critics say it won't—or at least may not—work.

The AEC and the nuclear industry insist that it will, and some have even pointed to the recent problems at Southern California's San Onofre power plant as proof that the emergency system works.

Mechanical problems there last October resulted in minor damage to the emergency cooling system, but the system did pump borated water to the reactor in response to automatic warning devices.

The water did not enter the reactor core because there really was no emergency—the core was still full of the primary coolant.

Officials with Southern California Edison Co., which owns 80% of San Onofre, have contended that the incident demonstrated the reliability of the equipment.

But the debate over the emergency core cooling system has had nothing to do with whether the pumps would work. In fact, just about everybody has assumed that the pumps would work.

Dr. Henry Kendall, professor of physics at

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, contends that if the primary cooling water were lost (through extensive pipe ruptures, for instance) pressures in the reactor core would build up so fast that the emergency cooling water would not be able to enter.

As a result, the reactor would melt. Some critics contend that the heat and pressures would be so great that the reinforced concrete dome over the reactor would be damaged, permitting the release of massive, deadly radiation.

Who is right?

That question could be answered by simply denying the primary coolant to an operating reactor.

If the AEC is right, the reactor would shut itself down automatically and the emergency cooling system would do its thing.

But if the AEC is wrong . . .

A special reactor could be built to test the system underground in the nuclear weapons testing area of Nevada, for instance. A complete, full-scale test could then be conducted safely.

Recently such a plan was suggested to the aid of one of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

"It could be done," he said, "but it would be terribly expensive to wipe out all of that equipment."

He was reminded that the system is supposed to save the equipment, not wipe it out.

If everything worked according to plan, the plant could be used to generate electricity, and nothing would have been lost while much would have been gained.

At this stage, however, the AEC has not seen fit to plan such a test.

In the long run, the questions of sabotage and diversion of bomb-grade nuclear materials may be of even greater significance than plant safety.

During an interview in his Washington office, L. Manning Muntzing, director of regulation for the AEC, conceded that a band of highly trained, sophisticated terrorists could conceivably take over a nuclear power plant near a major city and destroy it in such a way as to kill thousands—perhaps even millions—of people.

In order to be successful, the terrorists would have to know a great deal about nuclear power plants, but as time passes and nuclear reactors proliferate around the world that knowledge will become more common.

Some of the world's leading scientists expressed grave concern over this problem during the Pugwash Conference held in Finland last September.

The conference, with head offices in London, brings together about 100 scientists each year, many of whom are nuclear physicists who have been instrumental in the advancement of the nuclear age. UCSD's Alfvén is president of the conference.

In a report issued following the 23rd Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs, the scientists warned:

"The question of sabotage of nuclear reactors, waste shipments, or reprocessing plants generates especially grave concerns because this possibility renders all the theoretical failure probabilities meaningless.

"This may be an additional reason to place reactors and reprocessing plants deep underground, if research confirms any real accident-containment advantages for this approach.

"Other measures against sabotage discussed by the (conference) included very careful guarding of the installations themselves, perhaps facilitated by clustering the various facilities at one location."

"Unfortunately, it is difficult to believe that even these measures can be 100% effective."

The question of theft of bomb-grade material also brought expressions of grave con-

cern from the delegates. The Pugwash report stated:

"The problem of theft of nuclear material by internal groups or individuals intent on sabotage, terrorism or blackmail was agreed to be a very serious one."

The report points out that the breeder reactors will produce far greater amounts of dangerous byproducts than the present generation of reactors, but it concludes:

"The problem cannot be avoided simply by abandoning the breeder reactor, because, as noted above, all other reactor types also involve the use of materials available for weapons manufacture.

"It is difficult to see how the theft of such material can be made impossible in a world characterized by human failings, but measures to make such theft more difficult should be carefully studied and the best ones implemented as soon as possible."

In an effort to deal with this problem, the AEC recently tightened security requirements for nuclear facilities. However, a report to Congress by the comptroller general of the United States, dated Nov. 7, 1973, contains some rather startling observations.

The report (Improvements Needed in the Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Material) noted that "persons with the requisite technical expertise and the necessary resources can make a crude nuclear weapon from 17 kilograms (37½ pounds) of uranium or 6 kilograms of plutonium." You could almost carry that much in your pocket.

To aid in preparing their report, GAO investigators visited three of the 600 organizations authorized to possess what the AEC calls "special nuclear material." The investigators "noted several conditions at two of the three plants which significantly limited the plant's capability for preventing, detecting, and effectively responding to a possible diversion or diversion attempt."

Examples included fences that had holes large enough for people to get through. In some cases the holes were in areas where the guard could not see them.

Inspectors also found nuclear material stored in "a prefabricated steel structure which could be breached easily."

They also found ineffective guard patrols, ineffective alarm systems, a lack of automatic detection devices, and a lack of an action plan in the event of theft of material.

As the report notes, the opportunities for diversion will multiply as more and more nuclear plants and related facilities are built around the country. That obviously means more and more hazardous material will move along the streets and highways from one facility to the next.

Another GAO report, dated July 31, 1973 (Opportunity for AEC to Improve Its Procedures for Making Sure That Containers Used for Transporting Radioactive Materials Are Safe), notes:

"Annual shipments of the more hazardous types of radioactive materials in the United States are expected to increase nearly eightfold between 1972 and 1985—from 1,800 to 32,100 tons.

Debate broke out last year in Oregon when local citizens discovered that highly radioactive materials had been shipped through their state in unmarked trucks, and local officials were not even notified.

Local people figured they had a right to know about such things, but federal officials were concerned over the fact that informing the natives would also mean that potential hijackers would be alerted to the shipment.

So what do you do? Do you paint "radioactive" across the truck so the citizens know of the danger? Or do you disguise the shipment so that the hijackers won't know?

As it stands now, the government has decided that it is more important to keep the hijackers in the dark, but at least it tells local authorities about the shipments.

Some of these problems could be minimized by clustering nuclear power plants and related facilities together, far from population centers. Large areas of land could be set aside, thus permitting greater security for the entire operation.

Many executives within the AEC favor such "nuclear parks," but there is little evidence so far that the nation is moving in that direction. Nuclear power plant sites are still being approved across the country, and existing facilities are still being permitted to expand.

So it appears that the course for the future will follow about the same path as in the past. There will be more and more nuclear facilities in widely scattered areas of the country.

In addition, facilities will multiply not only in number, but in complexity as well—and quite possibly in hazards.

Earlier this year the AEC awarded contracts to Westinghouse for the nation's full-scale demonstration breeder reactor.

During extensive interviews with AEC executives in Washington, it became clear that the AEC believes the breeder is essential to the nuclear industry in order to guarantee an adequate supply of fuel. It also became clear that the country is already committed to the breeder, come what may.

The breeder is not merely another evolution in the nuclear cycle. It is a new breed of cat, and many pro-nuclear scientists are deeply concerned about the safety of the breeder.

The breeder will operate at such high temperatures that it will not be possible to cool it with water. As a result, liquid sodium will be used. Writing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, physicist Amory B. Lovins noted that a single breeder will contain roughly a ton of plutonium 239—a radiological poison so toxic that if properly reduced and dispersed, a ton of it would far more than suffice to give lung cancer to everyone on earth."

In describing breeder operations, Lovins said "The sodium, which is violently reactive with air or water, is to emerge (from the reactor core) intensely radioactive and heated to about 1,000 degrees F."

If such a system can even be made to work, can there be a guarantee that it will not deteriorate faster than it can be maintained? Perhaps time will tell.

Meanwhile, the nation will continue stockpiling deadly radioactive waste products for which it has no permanent repository.

The issue was summarized in the Pugwash Conference report:

"The as yet unsolved problem of radioactive waste management, and the possibly unsolvable problems of catastrophic releases of radioactivity or diversion of bomb-grade material, combine to create grave misgivings in the (conference) about the vast increase in the use of nuclear power that has been widely forecast."

Maybe that's why the questions won't go away.

WHAT IS THE PRICE OF DR. KISSINGER'S "PERSONAL DIPLOMACY?"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kissinger continues to receive praise and congratulations for his heroic efforts in separating the belligerent forces in the Middle East. Some consideration must be given to the cost the American peo-

ple must bear as the price for achieving peace through "personal diplomacy." Every American must understand that each success of Dr. Kissinger bears a price tag, the real cost of which has not as yet been divulged.

During the time of the Middle East negotiations and agreement, numerous accounts, some by administration spokesmen and others before Congress, suggests the price the American people have paid and will have to pay for Dr. Kissinger's triumph:

Foreign trade bill.  
Soviet wheat deal.  
Tax free status for the OAU.  
Grant of \$2.2 billion to Israel.  
Kissinger's trip to Panama to negotiate Canal surrender treaty.  
Senate repeal of Byrd amendment granting Soviet monopoly on chrome.  
U.S. helicopter sales to Red China.  
Renewed SALT talks on disarmament.  
Negotiations with Castro Cuba.  
Genocide Treaty consideration early in 1974.

The timing and the urgency with which each of these measures has been pushed can only suggest that they were part of the consideration of either showing our Government's seriousness or buying peace. The full disclosure is yet to come, if it is ever made to the American people.

I ask that related newsclippings follow:

[From the Washington Farmletter, Jan. 18, 1974]

#### BRUNTHAVER LEAVING

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Carroll Brunthaver has resigned, effective Jan. 31. He will go to the Brookings Institution and spend around six months on a study of an international grain reserve along the lines proposed by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Brunthaver, 41, has spent 5 years at USDA. He helped shape the current commodity programs, and has been a major target for critics of the Russian wheat sale.

[From the Washington Star-News, Jan. 17, 1974]

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger is planning a short visit to Panama early next month to show U.S. interest in diplomatic efforts to settle the Canal Zone question once and for all, according to informed sources.

Now on a peacemaking mission to the Middle East, Kissinger already is booked to meet with the Latin American foreign ministers in Mexico City Feb. 20 through 22. The trip to Panama comes as a surprise because it is described by informed sources as a one-country journey and because Kissinger is known to be planning a more extensive swing through Latin America in the spring.

The decision to go to Panama, according to insiders, emphasizes the new U.S. concern with reaching early agreement with the Panamanians on the future of the canal, the U.S.-controlled zone and the military bases agreement. There is also interest in possible future expansion of the canal facilities by addition of a third set of locks or excavation of a sea-level waterway.

It is believed that Kissinger will meet in Panama City with Demetrios Lakas, the figurehead president, Foreign Minister Juan Tack and Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, commander of the para-military Guardia Nacional and Panama's strongman.

Reports from Washington and Panama indicate Tack and Ellsworth Bunker, the roving U.S. ambassador who is in charge of canal treaty negotiations, now have agreed on a set of eight principles for accelerating the talks.

Kissinger's personal presence in Panama will tend to reinforce the idea that Panama and the United States have haggled long enough over the canal issues. Negotiations have been going on since 1967.

The United States has long recognized that Panama should and will recover control of the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone and eventually will be given control of the canal itself.

The White House, meanwhile, announced yesterday that a Kissinger aide in the National Security Council, William Jordan, will be nominated to be ambassador to Panama. Jordan, a former newspaperman, has been the NSC's resident expert on Latin America and liaison between the State Department's bureau of inter-American affairs and the White House. He succeeds Ambassador Robert Sayre.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser]

#### CUBANS SAY NOW THEY WILL TALK

MEXICO CITY.—Cuba is willing to begin talks with the United States on re-establishing diplomatic relations as soon as Washington lifts its 12-year-old economic blockade against Fidel Castro's island regime, a Cuban diplomat said b. 15.

"We are not in a holy war with the United States," said Dr. Fernando Lopez Muino, "but we will never undertake negotiations while the blockade is in effect."

He indicated that the U.S. Navy base at Guantanamo was not an issue.

Lopez Muino, Cuba's recently appointed ambassador to Mexico, met in his suburban embassy with a small group of Mexican and foreign newsmen invited by Cuban officials. The ambassador has been in Mexico for six months.

He specifically stated that the U.S.-controlled naval base at Guantanamo Bay was no longer an obstacle to any negotiations, "Guantanamo isn't important to us now," Lopez Muino stated.

Previously, the Cubans had declared that departure of the U.S. Navy from Guantanamo was a condition of getting Cuba to sit down at a negotiating table.

The ambassador's meeting with newsmen was the first such gathering since he arrived here. It occurred a little more than a month before Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger is to meet in Mexico City with Latin American foreign ministers to discuss current and future relations between Washington and those countries.

"I guess you could speculate that the ambassador's meeting has something to do with the Kissinger visit," a Cuban source said.

[From the Washington Star-News Jan. 15, 1974]

#### CHINA NEGOTIATES FOR AMERICAN COPTERS

(By George Sherman)

China is negotiating for large American helicopters which might be used in military patrols along her northern borders with the Soviet Union.

Informed sources say the U.S. government has taken the initial step of allowing United Aircraft Corp. to give Peking "sales information" on the Sikorsky medium-heavy helicopter—the S61N.

A spokesman for United confirmed that preliminary conversations with China for a fleet of helicopters are under way both in Peking and at the company headquarters in East Hartford, Conn.

At the same time, according to diplomatic sources, United is further along in talks with Romania for co-production in Romania of 50 of these helicopters valued at \$100 million. That deal, which would need government-backed financing from the Export-Import Bank, is now being discussed in Bucharest, after an informal meeting between President Nicolae Ceausescu and United officials in Connecticut during Ceausescu's visit to the United States in December.

Romania, the most independent of Soviet allies in East Europe, has repeatedly refused to take sides with Moscow against Peking. Officials note that a helicopter deal with either Peking or Bucharest would be the first time the United States has allowed heavy-duty helicopters to be sold outside the Western allied world.

A sale to China, say U.S. officials, is bound to increase suspicions in Moscow that the United States is taking sides in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Therefore, they suggest, any completion of the current "preliminary discussions" between United and China will involve a policy decision by President Nixon.

The S61N, a twin-turbine engine all-weather helicopter with amphibious capabilities, can carry 26 to 30 passengers. A version of it is used by President Nixon to travel between the White House and Camp David.

United Aircraft officials say that both China and Romania would be sold the commercial version of the S61N. It would not contain such military features as bullet-proof gas tanks, "hard points" for attaching machine guns, missiles and bombs, or have the more powerful engines used by the American military.

For this reason, licensing for the export would go through the Commerce Department rather than the State Department, which operates the restrictive Munitions Controls List Under the Mutual Securities Act of 1954, all military sales to Communist countries are embargoed, unless the President specifically authorizes them.

But Pentagon officials acknowledge that a distinction between civilian and military uses is virtually impossible to make for helicopters. Nothing would prevent China, they say, from using the S61N to ferry its patrols between border outposts on the long Soviet border.

Reportedly Peking representatives suggested that might be one possible use. These representatives apparently first suggested to United that the company cooperate in setting up an assembly plant for the helicopter in Sian, in north central China.

But company officials say that China has been told such a deal is out of the question because the United States does not want to allow such advanced technology into China.

The most that would be possible, would be delivery of a limited number of helicopters with spare parts from the United States.

In the case of Romania however—whose relations with the United States have steadily grown more cordial over the past five years—just such a coproduction offer has been made by the company with U.S. government blessing.

According to informed diplomats, Romania has stressed the civilian uses of the helicopter such as for transportation in desolate, rural areas. Currently Romania relies on Soviet helicopters and a limited number of French helicopters.

China had its first contact with United Aircraft through its maintenance teams that traveled to Connecticut to learn about the Pratt-Whitney engine produced by the company for the Boeing 707 jet airliner. China has purchased 10 of the 707s, and the first was delivered last month.